

# THE LONDON QUARTERLY AND HOLBORN REVIEW

APRIL 1933

## THE OXFORD MOVEMENT

THE Year 1933 marks the centenary of the Oxford Movement. On July 14, 1833, John Keble preached at St. Mary's, Oxford, a sermon on 'National Apostasy' when he raised the standard against the armies of 'liberalism,' and so started what is known as 'The Oxford Movement.' Newman always looked back on this event as the beginning of a new era, and wrote in his *Apologia*—'Sunday, July 14, Mr. Keble preached the Assize Sermon in the University Pulpit. It was published under the title of National Apostasy. I have ever considered and kept that day, as the start of the religious movement of 1833.'

The Movement, however, had earlier beginnings, and is closely related to the stirring events of that period. The French Revolution, and the tyranny and fierce secularism to which it gave birth, had stricken many with strong fears. The abolition of the Test and Corporation Acts; the 1830 Revolution in France, and the dismissal of the Bourbons; the passing of the Reform Bill; the insulting of the prelates in the streets of London, because of their opposition to Reform; Lord Grey's message to the bishops to set their house in order: these and many other events had filled the minds of many Churchmen with high alarm. The debates about the Irish Church, which led sixteen days after Keble's Oxford Sermon to the reduction of its archbishops and bishops from twenty to twelve, made many wonder where the reformer would next smite with his axe. The attitude of John Keble to this is clearly seen in his poem 'Profanation,' published in *The British Magazine* in March, 1833. His anger blazes forth in the words—

the ruffian band

Come to reform, where ne'er they came to pray.

Out of all the 'liberalising' of this period, but not merely because of this, rose the Oxford Movement. It was a child born of seriousness and perplexity, of a fierce distrust of the new power lately given to the people, and of a deep love for the Church of England. The times provoked men to ask the questions:—What is the Church? What is the relation of the Church to the State? Is the Church of England a part of the Catholic Church? This last question had been, in the seventeenth century, asked and answered by the High Church Caroline Divines, and the reply had been in the affirmative. The Whig divines of the eighteenth century had not troubled about such problems, and the rise of the Evangelical Movement had turned men's minds away from ecclesiastical problems, to the question of personal salvation. From the beginning of the nineteenth century to 1833, the Evangelicals had been the dominant party in the Church, and although it has been the fashion to pass harsh judgements upon them, we believe that to do so is to falsify history. 'These Evangelical Churchmen,' as Canon Overton has said, 'constituted by far the most prominent and spiritually active party during the greater part of the period before us (1800–1833). They were the salt of the earth in their day, and the Church owes a debt of gratitude to those holy men, which it will never forget so long as personal piety and the spiritual side of religion are valued at their proper worth.' They placed little emphasis on apostolical succession, but revealed the strength and tenderness of apostolic life. They freed the slaves, and did much to purify and strengthen the spiritual life of their country. But at the same time there was a small party of clergymen in England, who turned back to the Caroline Divines, and to primitive Christianity, and who, while inclining neither to Rome nor Dissent, sought to prove the Catholic nature of the Church of England.

Amongst the forerunners of the Oxford Movement, a place must be given to Alexander Knox. He was a link betwixt Wesley and the Tractarian Movement. He was born in



1757, and died in 1831—two years before Keble preached his sermon on 'National Apostasy.' He early came under the influence of John Wesley, and ever retained for him a deep admiration and love. He revered him as a man of apostolic life. No one has more thoroughly appreciated Wesley's catholic spirit. Nevertheless, although he never wavered in his loyalty to Wesley, he thought that the work of Methodism, though of high service for its time, was of a temporary nature. He believed that the followers of Wesley had laid true foundations, but that the Church was needed to give to converts the superstructure of catholic teaching. There is something strangely winning about this Dublin recluse. He is tolerant of others, but his own preference is for what he thought was primitive and catholic teaching. He believed that the Church of England was not Roman nor Protestant, but Catholic. He saw, even amidst the perversions of Rome, many things which were good in that system, and writes: 'In the mixed mass of the Roman religion there is gold and silver, and precious stones, as well as wood, hay, and stubble; and that everything of the former nature is to be as carefully preserved as everything of the latter nature is to be wisely neglected.' He had an appreciative understanding of the Reformation, but thought that amidst much that was good in that movement, there were great Catholic truths which it had neglected. The letters of Newman and of other leaders of the Oxford Movement, show that they saw in Alexander Knox and in his intimate friend, Dr. Jebb, Bishop of Limerick, to whom Knox wrote so many letters, two of the heralds of that movement. Knox revealed a more tolerant spirit than the Tractarians, and his emphasis was less on the ecclesiastical than on the religious side: but it is incontestable that his influence upon the Oxford Movement was much greater than has been realized. His thoughts were germinal, and later on they brought forth their harvest.

Another influence prior to that date, which Newman always regarded as 'the start of the religious movements of

1833,' is to be found in the publication of *The Christian Year*. It is somewhat difficult now to realize the stir and success of Keble's verses. Their appeal has declined, but their influence was tremendous, and the year of their publication—1827—is one of the great dates in the history of the Oxford Movement. Newman said that they were *fons et origo*. It has been truly said 'The Christian Year claimed to teach *quod fuit ab initio*, not to trumpet a new creed or a new view; and by its great and immediate popularity and wide circulation it created its own atmosphere, and prepared Churchmen to defend the doctrines which it set forth in a peculiarly attractive and endearing manner, by connecting them with the parochial and domestic religion of English Church people.' Prior to 1833, several of the poems which later found a place in *Lyra Apostolica* (1836) had been published in the *British Magazine*. They were ecclesiastical rather than apostolic, and sounded forth trumpet calls to many. The Oxford Movement—like all great religious movements—was allied to song. And as the Franciscans counted amongst their numbers singers such as Francis and Jacopone da Todi, as the Reformation welcomed Luther and a nest of singing birds, as the Evangelical Revival rejoiced in the hymns of John and Charles Wesley and many others, so the Oxford Movement hailed as its singers, John Keble, Isaac Williams, and John Henry Newman.

There were other influences which were at work before 1833. Newman has pointed out that Sir Walter Scott, by his novels, had created a vivid interest in the Mediæval Ages and the days of chivalry, and that by so doing had turned the gaze of men to the past. There can be no doubt that Coleridge's theological writings awoke echoes in many minds, but here the High Churchman was only a partial follower of that stimulating teacher. Wordsworth has also been claimed as an ally, but it was to the older Wordsworth that they went, the one in whom the fires of the Revolution and of lyrical poetry had died down into the settled ecclesiasticism and conservatism of later days.

It is clear that the Oxford Movement developed out of a part of the history of the Anglican Church, which has never been without its High Church tradition: out of certain ecclesiastical events which had a disturbing effect upon many lovers of the Church; out of a love of order and a conservative temper; out of a distrust of democracy, and out of fears as to what catastrophes threatened the Church now that the Reform Bill had given the franchise to so many, amongst them being dissenters and secularists, who had no love for the Church of England. The Tractarian leaders saw the rising wave of 'liberalism,' and wrongly believed that unless it was hurled back it would engulf them. The 'liberalism' which filled them with such panic, later came in full flood, to the good and not to the hurt of what is vital in religion. Oxford is no longer the home of those only who subscribe to the thirty-nine articles. Dissenters long ago were admitted to that University, and its D.D. degree can now be won, and given *Honoris Causa*, to any one who is worthy of that high honour. Dissenters are examiners in the Theological Schools. The 'liberalism' which they feared, liberalised the whole University of Oxford, and it is no longer the exclusive home of the Church of England. This, we are convinced, is for the good of Oxford, and we believe that it has given a deeper and richer content to its motto, *Dominus Illuminatio Mea*. It seems to us that many of their fears were utterly baseless, and that they often stood for privilege rather than for essential religion.

The years between 1833 and 1845 gave rise to many bitter fights, and grave injustices, to party rancours, both Tractarian and Anti-Tractarian, and at the end the dominant figure of the many battles—John Henry Newman—was received on October 9, 1845, by Father Dominic, the Passionist, into the Roman Church. The same day—such is the irony of history—Ernest Renan passed out of the St. Sulpice, Paris, and for ever ceased to be a priest. The story of those twelve eventful years has been told by many, and is familiar to all students of the Oxford Movement. It has become a part not only of

history, but also of literature, for two men, J. H. Newman and R. W. Church, have written books about it that can never die. Each book is marked by the sincerity and genius of the writer. Neither is to us convincing, but each is poignantly tender, and alluringly fascinating. Each is an Odyssey, the one told by the Ulysses who was the central hero of the long voyage, and whose Ithaca was Rome; the other recorded by one who was more an observer than a fighter, in those years so full of the clash of battle, but who watched and understood. The literature of the Movement is voluminous. But when all has been said, there is something in it which will never be fathomed, for at the heart of it there is Newman, and where he is there is charm, sincerity, high resolve, deft and dexterous handling of words, psychological insight, genius, and mystery. On the first page of his *Apologia*, he wrote *Meum Secretum Mihi* and that secret still is his.

We remember standing once in the Hall of Keble College, Oxford, and a divine, well known in Oxford, said, as he pointed to Cardinal Newman's portrait, 'Newman did more for the Church which he left, than the Church to which he went.' We do not wish to argue about the relative merits of Newman's contribution to the Anglican Church and the Roman Church. It is, however, clear that two sons of the Church of England, John Wesley and John Henry Newman, who died in communions other than those of their earlier days, have made lasting contributions to that Church.

The more we read of the Oxford Movement, the more interesting becomes the story. Its *a priori* reasoning, its selective method of dealing with history, its intolerance of Evangelicalism, its timidity as to 'liberalism,' its fear of change and of inquiry make no appeal to us. Nevertheless, we have learned much from it, and it is on its contribution, rather than on its defects, that we would linger. It certainly shows what can be done by a few men of gifts and sincerity. The Tractarian Leaders relied not on organization, nor on appeals to those in authority, but on faith in their crusade,

on fearless courage, on knowing exactly what they wanted. We see this most dramatically in Newman who was, in truth, *facile princeps*. Newman always said that he was no party leader—that is true—for at heart he was an individualist. Nevertheless, he created a party by the passionate intensity of his devotion. His industry, his polemical gifts, his brilliant power in stating his case, his lucid suppleness of style, his treatises, his sermons, all played their part in capturing public interest, and winning followers. He shows what he owed to John Keble, Hurrell Froude, Dr. Pusey, and others, but the words of J. Anthony Froude are true—‘Compared with him they were all ciphers, and he the indicating number.’ We have for that reason in this survey dealt chiefly with Newman. It is he who wields the bow of Ulysses, and often with the savage fierceness of that ancient hero. He believes in his crusade, and hurls himself into the fray. ‘When I was left by myself the thought came upon me that deliverance is wrought, not by the many, but by the few; not by bodies, but by persons.’ Again he shows his individualism in these words: ‘No great work was done by a system; whereas systems arise out of individual exertions. Luther was an individual. The very faults of an individual excite attention; he loses, but his cause (if good and he powerfully-minded) gains. This is the way of things, we promote truth by self-sacrifice.’ It was on his return from Rome (1833) that he wrote: ‘It was the success of the Liberal cause which fretted me inwardly. I became fierce against its instruments and its manifestations.’ With Hurrell Froude he then began the *Lyra Apostolica*. ‘The motto shows the feeling of both Froude and myself at the time. We borrowed from M. Bunsen a Homer, and Froude chose the words in which Achilles, on returning to the battle, says, “You shall know the difference when I am back again.”’ When Monsignore Wiseman ‘courteously expressed a wish that we might make a second visit to Rome, I said with great gravity, “We have a work to do in England.”’ When his servant asked him what



ailed him, he said, 'I have a work to do in England.' Newman's way was not to work through Committees, nor through associations of Loyal Churchmen, nor by seeking the lowest common-denominator of a society. Never was there a more individualistic fighter than Newman. He took his own way, worked with those who took the same road, and asked not for speedy results, but patiently wrought and waited. The history of 1833-1845 clearly proves this, and his years within the Church of Rome (1845-1890) give us many illustrations of this fact. Amidst all the whirl and hurry of battle, amidst all the din of controversy, Newman fights on unperturbed, indefatigable, indomitable, for he believes in God, himself, and his mission. His days in the Anglican Church close when Newman is forty-four. What a work he had done in that time, and how central to it all he seems now! The victories which came to him were those which are begotten of fearless courage, and high belief in a holy cause. We learn from this Movement what Newman called 'The Ventures of Faith.'

Again we are impressed by the passion for God of Newman and of his allies. We remember standing with a friend on the wide lawn of Trinity College, Oxford, gazing at the bust of Newman, which stands outside the rooms of his old Tutor—Thomas Short—when the friend said, 'What a sense of God that man had!' He was from a child deeply religious, and his life is summed up in the words, 'One thing have I asked of the Lord, that will I seek after; that I may dwell in the house of the Lord all the days of my life, to behold the beauty of the Lord, and to inquire in His temple.' We believe that it is true that place and power were not attractive to him. He lived restlessly amongst temporal things, for he was at heart aching for the eternal. He writes of the power of early forces, 'in isolating me from the objects which surrounded me, in confirming me in my distrust of the reality of material phenomena, making me rest in the thought of two, and two only supreme and luminously self-evident beings, myself and

my Creator.' He speaks of his 'inward conversion, of which I was conscious (and of which [fifty years later], I still am more certain than that I have hands or feet).' Principal Shairp in memorable words describes Newman's preaching in St. Mary's and says, 'The look and bearing of the preacher were as of one who dwelt apart, who though he knew his age well did not dwell in it. From his seclusion of study, and abstinence and prayer, from habitual dwelling in the unseen, he seemed to come forth that one day of the week to speak to others of the things he had seen and known. . . . And the tone of voice in which they were spoken sounded like a fine strain of unearthly music.' Thomas Mozley said of him, 'He lived in a region of faith, and therefore not of exact calculation.' The *Parochial and Plain Sermons* bear witness in a thousand places to his hunger for the unseen. In Newman's sermon on 'The Invisible World' he writes: 'We know that what we see is a screen hiding from us God and Christ, and his saints and angels. And we earnestly desire for the dissolution of all that we see, from our longing after that which we cannot see.' What hunger for Eternity! The deepest truth in the whole of Newman's life is revealed in the motto which he adopted, when made a Cardinal—*Cor ad Cor Loquitur*.

This longing for God, and this realization of His presence gave to the Tractarian leaders a deep sense of awe. Life for them was a serious affair. There was for them the *mysterium tremendum*. R. W. Church speaks of Newman's 'never unfelt consciousness of the true awfulness of anything connected with religion.' Again he writes of the ineffacable stamp the Oxford Movement left upon those even 'who left it with judgement unfavourable to its theology.' They felt 'this keen sense of the awfulness of things unseen. There was something *sui generis* in the profoundly serious, profoundly reverent tone, about everything that touched religion in all who had ever come strongly under its influence.' The Tractarians realized the need of self-discipline and yearned

for holiness. This was a marked feature in Newman from his earliest days. He learned from the Evangelical, Thomas Scott, of whom he wrote: 'I deeply felt his influence, and for years I used almost as proverbs what I considered to be the scope and issue of his doctrine—"Holiness before peace," and "Growth is the only evidence of life."' If Newman had known the writings of John Wesley, he would have learned from that teacher the same lesson, and would not have written these ignorant words about him: 'I do not like Wesley—putting aside his exceeding self-confidence, he seems to have a black self-will, a bitterness of religious passion which is very unamiable.' They both, however, agree together now. For the words of Newman are true: 'Adversaries agree together directly they are dead, if they have lived and walked in the Holy Ghost.' The bitter things written by some of the leaders of the Oxford Movement about Justification by Faith sprang from their misunderstanding of that great doctrine. It is never understood by those who separate it from sanctification—the growing in the grace and knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. It sings of the faith that works by love. They were tilting at the perversion of a great evangelical truth—they were wrong in their negation, but we owe much to their insistence upon the truth that life is a long discipline, that the organ of apprehending truth becomes keener as man becomes more moral, and more obedient to God's will. As R. W. Church so truly says: 'The Oxford writers had all along laid stress on the paramount necessity of the single eye and the disciplined heart in accepting or judging religion; moral subjects could only be appreciated by moral experience; purity, reverence, and humility were as essential in such questions as zeal, industry, truthfulness and honesty.'

We believe that the Oxford leaders read imperfectly some of the lessons of history, but we rejoice that they forced upon so many veneration for the past, and for the saints of all the ages. We must travel back in order that we may go forward.

We can claim kinship with Augustine, with Francis, with Bernard of Clairvaux, with Santa Teresa, with Catharine of Siena, with Luther, with Wesley, and with Newman. We are, both Catholics and Protestants—the heirs of all the ages. We realize that the Oxford Movement, though narrowly interpreting the theory of Apostolic succession, did a great service, when it turned men's eyes to the history of the Church, and to the glory of its saints. We may debate as to the meaning of this history. The Oxford Movement has, however, enriched, within and without their own communion, the meaning of the words 'I believe in the Catholic Church.'

There was much that was transitory in the movement, many things which we reject, but we can learn from men whose faith in a life devoted to God led them to such daring enterprises, to whom the eternal was the goal of all their dreams and hopes, who felt such a deep sense of awe in religion, who enforced the need for discipline, and insisted that moral factors are essential for spiritual discovery, and 'sought out the ancient Mother,' and revealed the triumphant march of the Church through the ages. Newman is indeed 'the indicating number.' How he irritates and provokes us! How full of contradictions he is! For he is so sensitive, so tenderly kind—but ever and anon, is as ferocious as a tiger. What noble words he wrote about the Church of England, yet a few times he pours out upon her vitriolic words of wrath. We are aware of all that, but still his spell is upon us. It is not merely his style that holds us, it is rather his etherealness, his air of another country, his subtle, spiritual charm. Wilfred Ward tells the story of his father—W. G. Ward—who was in the thick of the Tractarian fight at Oxford, and with Newman passed to Rome, wherein for nearly twenty years he was estranged from Newman. 'My Father, a year before he died,' says Wilfred Ward, 'told me how in a dream he found himself at a dinner party next to a veiled lady, who charmed him more and more as she talked. At last he exclaimed—"I have never felt such charm in conversation

since I used to talk with John Henry Newman at Oxford." "I am John Henry Newman," the lady replied, and raising her veil showed the well-known face.' We understand why many in Oxford said *Credo in Newmannum*. It was not logic only that bound them, the cords were more silken—for it was charm. We find Newman less and less convincing, and more and more suggestive and fascinating. He is so elusive, so unfathomable, but we believe we understand him in three places. When we sing 'Lead Kindly Light' and also when we read the words of *The Dream of Gerontius*:

And these two pains, so counter and so keen,—  
The longing for Him, when thou seest Him not;  
The shame of self at thought of seeing Him,—  
Will be thy veriest, sharpest purgatory.

And again we understand him, when we stand at Rednal, at the foot of the hills in the little garden cemetery of the country home of the Birmingham Oratorian Fathers, and see Newman's only earthly resting place, and the simple Cross with the words upon it:

*Ex Umbris Ex Imaginibus In Veritatem.*

He had chosen this motto himself, and it reminds us that all ecclesiastical and theological fightings,—necessary though they may be—are amidst the shadows, and the semblances of things, and that he has pierced the Veil, and found Truth in the Presence of God.

W. BARDSLEY BRASH.



# 'AT JOHN MURRAY'S'

*At John Murray's.* Records of a Literary Circle, 1843-1892.

By George Paston. Preface by the Rt. Hon. Lord Ernle. (John Murray. 1932.)

LORD ERNLE'S Preface gives a bird's eye view of a hundred and fifty years of our literary life. The competition of publishers with one another has increased tenfold; circulating libraries have been developed; advertisement has become both a science and an art; stately editions have given place to cheaper and handier forms; the three-volume novel is dead; biography is being converted into something like the labour-saving flats of once stately mansions. Amid such a revolutionary era it needed a rare mixture of industry, of variety of interests, of discernment, of enthusiasm and wariness, of loyalty and generosity to authors to keep a publishing house alive and in the first rank, and that John Murray III accomplished during his reign in Albemarle Street which lasted from 1843 to 1892.

In 1882 Lord Ernle was going with a friend to watch the final stage of the Lawn Tennis Tournament at Wimbledon. Opposite them in the railway carriage sat an elderly man, with the most strained and tired-looking eyes that Mr. Prothero had ever seen, correcting proof sheets in smallest types. He recognized the proofs as part of Murray's Handbooks for France, which had been his daily companions for months, and whispered to his friend: 'That man is correcting Murray's *Guide to France*.' Compton answered, 'It's old Murray himself. I'll introduce you.' Mr. Prothero sent him a sheaf of notes on French inns, was invited to dinner, and talked with him about the early years of the Handbooks. He became a frequent contributor to the *Quarterly Review*, and in the last months of his life Murray proposed that Prothero should write a biography of Dean Stanley. When

Prothero found that he could not bring out the *Life* in 1893 without giving up other work, Murray solved the problem by making a very generous addition to the original offer. Stanley's hand-writing, the publisher thought, was the worst he had ever known. Still that had advantages. 'It commanded the most skilled attention, while yours is so good that all the apprentices will be turned on your manuscript.' He did not live to rejoice over the success of the *Life* which was published in two volumes at 32s. 6d. and went into five editions within a few months. The American edition had a similar success.

In 1768 the first John Murray, a Lieutenant of Marines, aged twenty-three, bought the bookselling business of William Sandby, in Fleet Street, for £400. He told a friend whom he wished to become his partner: 'Many blockheads in the trade are making fortunes, and did we not succeed as well as they, I think it must be imputed only to ourselves.' Falconer, however, had a good post waiting for him in India and declined. He sailed in the *Aurora* which was never heard of after it left Cape Hope. Young Murray printed a ship in full sail on his invoices and announced that he would sell all new publications, fit up libraries and execute foreign commissions, 'all at the most reasonable rates.' He had bought from Sandby the right to publish on commission two or three important works and brought out at his own risk a poem which ran through seven editions in a little over a year. His old naval comrades stood by him and when he received a legacy of £4,000 in 1775 he began to publish such books as Mitford's *History of Greece* and the first volume of Isaac D'Israeli's *Curiosities of Literature*. Those war times did not encourage literature, and Murray told a friend in Oxford: 'I am fatigued from morning till night about two-penny matters, if any of which is forgotten I am complained of as a man who minds not his own business. I pray Heaven for a lazy and lucrative office, and then I shall with alacrity turn my shop out of window.' Fortunately the prayer was not answered!

His son, John the Second, went to the High School at Edinburgh and then to Dr. Burney's school at Gosport. He was fifteen when his father died, but his mother and Samuel Highley, 'the faithful assistant,' carried on the business for two years till the boy left school and entered into partnership with Highley, who was so timid and old-fashioned that in 1803 when he retired John was able, as he said, to 'plunge alone into the depths of literary speculation.' He won the name of 'Glorious John,' yet for all his forty years of success, he was naturally indolent, hated writing letters, or reading manuscripts, and drove authors mad by his procrastination. He was really 'The Playboy of the Publishing World,' but he had imagination, a streak of romance, and the instinct to seize the happy moment and attract the coming man. He became London agent for Constables, who introduced him to Walter Scott and sold him a quarter share in *Marmion*. In Edinburgh also he found a wife, Anne Elliot, whom he married in 1807.

On March 1, 1809 the first number of the *Quarterly* appeared with four of its eighteen articles by Scott. Murray told Gifford the editor: 'My character is at stake upon it. My mind is so entirely engrossed, my honour is so completely involved in this one thing, that I neither eat, drink, nor sleep upon anything else.' It did not pay for two years, then Southey wrote, 'Murray is a happy fellow, living in the light of his own glory. The *Review* is the greatest of all works, and it is all his own creation. He prints ten thousand copies and fifty times ten thousand read its contents in the East and in the West.' *Childe Harold*, published in 1812, made Byron famous and emboldened Murray to buy 50 Albemarle Street for £3,822. The house was excellent, and in the morning his drawing-room became an elegant library where, he wrote, 'I am in the habit of seeing persons of the highest rank in literature and talent, such as Canning, Frere, Mackintosh, Southey, Campbell, Walter Scott, Madame de Staël, Gifford, Croker, Barrow, Lord Byron, and others.'

He paid Byron a thousand guineas for the *Siege of Corinth* and *Parisina* and when the poet was in such straits that he thought of selling his library, Murray sent him a cheque for £1,500 and promised to send another for £1,500 in a few weeks. He offered to sell the copyrights and hand Byron the profits, but the poet declined though 'it sets my opinion of you, and indeed of human nature, in a different light from that in which I have been accustomed to consider it.' Murray had a stroke of good fortune when Jane Austen whose *Pride and Prejudice* and *Sense and Sensibility* had attracted little notice, sent him the manuscript of *Emma* in 1815. Sir Walter Scott dashed off an article for the *Quarterly* in which he said: 'We bestow no mean compliment upon the author of *Emma* when we say that, keeping close to common incidents and to such characters as occupy the ordinary walks of life, she has produced sketches of such spirit and originality that we never miss the excitation which depends upon a narrative of uncommon events.' The Prince Regent became a 'Janeite' and sent his thanks for the handsome copy of *Emma* which she sent him. She told Murray: 'Whatever he may think of my share of the work, yours seems to have been quite right.'

Murray joined Blackwood in purchasing Scott's *Tales of a Grandfather* which the pair read with 'streaming eyes and grinning cheeks.' Murray declared it was by Scott or the devil, and added that he might as well throw all his other books into the Thames, for no one would either read them or buy them. Murray bought a half-share in *Blackwood's Magazine* for £1,000 but he was furious over its violent assaults. 'Why in God's name,' he wrote to Blackwood, 'do you think it *indispensable* that each number must give pain to someone or other? Why not think of giving pleasure to all?' When no notice was taken of his appeal he sold his share.

The earlier cantos of Byron's *Don Juan* were in such demand that copies had to be handed out of the ground floor windows

to the mob of booksellers' messengers. Murray pleaded with Byron to wrap up 'certain approximations to indecorum,' for there were a few lines which 'no lady could read.' He returned the later cantos because some extracts read to him 'were so outrageously shocking that I would not publish them if you would give me your Estate, Title and Genius.' On Crabbe's poems he lost something like £2,000. He made, however, an enormous success over *Mrs. Markham's History of England* and amazed every one when he gave two thousand guineas for the copyright of Mrs. Rundell's *Domestic Cookery*. It turned out a most profitable speculation.

Murray had now reached the height of success. He had rented a villa at Wimbledon, but in 1823 moved into a fine new house in Whitehall Place. Albemarle Street was given up solely to business. He burnt his fingers badly over *The Representative*, in which Benjamin Disraeli played a prominent part. The quarrel between the Disraelis and Murrays was patched up by Sharon Turner. Murray felt that his 'only fault was in loving Benjamin not wisely but too well.' The house in Whitehall Place and the villa at Wimbledon had to be given up and the family returned to Albemarle Street. There Murray recovered health and threw himself with renewed energy into his work. Lockhart was proving an admirable editor of the *Quarterly*, punctual, business-like, and unexpectedly tactful with his contributors.

Murray paid about £4,000 for Moore's *Life and Letters of Lord Byron* in the early thirties, and lost £300 over it. In 1839 he found publishing books involved nothing but loss, and had to withdraw every work in the printers' hands. He spent a good deal of time at watering places vainly seeking a cure for rheumatism. John III was now thirty and conducted most of the correspondence, but was kept too much in the background. He had been sent to the Charterhouse and then to Edinburgh University. He was present, in 1827, at the dinner where Scott acknowledged the authorship of the *Waverley Novels*. Scott invited him to breakfast at



Abbotsford and wrote in his journal: 'English boys have this advantage that they are well-bred and can converse when ours are regular little cubs. I am not sure it is an advantage in the long run. It is a temptation to premature display.' John's chief interest was in science, especially geology and mineralogy. He now spent two years on the Continent. There were no English guide-books, and he was so bewildered at Rotterdam that he collected all the information a tourist would need. On his return he arranged his material in routes, with notes on art, history, and architecture. His father published them in 1836 as a *Handbook* to Holland, Belgium and North Germany. Other Handbooks were written by John on South Germany, Switzerland and Italy. He visited Goethe at Weimar and at Trieste met Byron's friend and banker, Mr. Barry of Genoa. The Handbooks were in great request, but the *Quarterly* had declined in circulation. Murray refused to give lower pay to his contributors. He wrote a kind and appreciative letter to Lockhart, who replied, 'I have out-lived so many misfortunes and disappointments that it is no wonder I should need encouragement and support.' He added that John had given abundant evidence that he was able and willing to bear a most useful part in our consultation. 'Pray encourage him to proceed. His youth, his different circle of acquaintances, his own selected pursuits, are all new sources on which we may hope to draw largely for spirited suggestions and important advice.'

Elizabeth Rigby, afterwards Lady Eastlake, was long the only woman contributor to the *Review*. Lockhart had no doubt that she was 'the cleverest female writer now in England, the most original in thought and expression too, and she seems *good* besides, which after all has its charm for old sinners like you and me.' The famous Mrs. Norton was also a favourite with Murray, and Lord Shaftesbury had staunch supporters in Albemarle Street. George Borrow submitted his first book *The Gipsies in Spain*. It was

followed by *The Bible in Spain*, containing he said, 'all my queer adventures in that queer country while engaged in distributing the Gospel.' It went through several expensive editions in three volumes and brought substantial profits.

Murray died on June 27, 1843, leaving all his property, about £50,000, to his wife. John III had to buy the business from his mother and to delay his marriage, but he had strong friends and his Home and Colonial Library of useful and entertaining volumes at half a crown started well. Miss Rigby stayed nearly three months at Albemarle Street in 1844. Carlyle called, 'bringing his wife—certainly a more refined half—but he is an honest, true man, a character such as he himself alone can describe. He is a kind of Burns in appearance—the head of a thinker, the eye of a lover, and the mouth of a peasant.' She spent a delightful evening with the Murrays at Cheyne Row. 'Carlyle, perfect in his way, is a very wayward genius, now kindly, now fretful, the best laugh I ever heard, and, I doubt not, a tear in season. . . . I never felt myself in more thoroughly intellectual society—such great knowledge and such equal originality. Mrs. Carlyle interested me. She is lively and clever, and evidently very happy.' Miss Rigby thought George Borrow 'a fine man but a most disagreeable one.'

The Handbooks were growing in favour and friends sent hints and corrections. Gladstone offered to send notes from Sicily; Thackeray asked if he could bring back any useful material from his tour of the Rhine, Switzerland and Italy. The publisher was known to favour books of travel, and these flowed in freely. His mother's death in 1846 enabled John III to marry Marion Smith. She had hesitated to accept him because she thought herself unable to preside at the dinners to famous guests. Those fears were dismissed and her husband found her 'a treasure beyond compare' and 'prized her above all on earth.'

Business brought many interesting visitors. Harriet Martineau's *Travels in the East* were accepted before they were

written, but when the first two volumes came in, Murray declined to publish what he found to be 'a work of infidel tendency, with the obvious aim of deprecating the authority and invalidating the veracity of the Bible.' Miss Martineau was surprised and indignant, but Murray would not yield. Layard's *Nineveh* was a happy success. He would have been quite content with £200 for the copyright but Murray insisted on half profits, and Layard's share was about £1,500 for some years. Nearly 8,000 copies were sold in the first year. Murray announced a steady, continuous sale which, Layard said, would 'place it side by side with *Mrs. Rundell's Cookery*, and make it property.'

Miss Rigby married Mr. Eastlake on April 9, 1849, and in November he was knighted and elected President of the Royal Academy. Mrs. Grote carried on her husband's correspondence with Murray and helped to correct his proofs. His *History of Greece* was such a success that Murray proposed to take only a third of the profits instead of the half on which he had agreed. Mrs. Grote was a 'perfect gentleman' whilst he was 'a very ladylike person.' She laughed at her 'historian' but says that living with him cured her of self-conceit, and made her conscious of her inferiority most days in the week. Lady Eastlake regarded her as a woman of commanding intellect and great attainments. She was also a housewife who 'knew when a hoop was off a pail in the back kitchen, and the best way to put it on again.' She took Jenny Lind entirely under her wing, and when the famous singer was starring it in America, she told Mr. Murray 'How that shy creature, to whom a new face was ever disagreeable, and which she ever anxiously sought to avoid meeting; how Jenny Lind will endure seeing daily 300 new Phizzes, and being gazed upon by them is to me a marvel! . . . The Yankees seem to outdo the Englishmen in their extravagant homage. We certainly did not go drumming under the poor hunted girl's windows at midnight to show our love.' George Borrow's wife could make a first-rate treacle posset and was

the best business woman in East Anglia. *Lavengro* did not repeat the success of *The Bible in Spain*. It took nearly twenty-five years to sell the first edition of 3,000. Murray was bountiful to his authors. The *Grenville Papers* cost him £3,000, and he paid Lord Campbell £3,737 for his *Lives of the Chancellors*. Murray himself made a net profit of £10,000 for several years and built himself a house at Wimbledon, which he called Newstead in memory of Byron. John IV was born in 1851.

Good things were sometimes missed. Mr. Justice Coleridge wrote to recommend Charlotte Yonge, but Murray refused the *Heir of Redcliffe*, which had a great vogue. When Lockhart's health was breaking up Whitwell Elwin, rector of Booton, became temporary editor of the *Quarterly*. In acknowledging a cheque of £36 15s. 0d. he wrote: 'I furnish my Parishioners with seventy new and original sermons, at the rate of three a week, for the same money—not to speak of the parochial duty which occupies far more time than the discourses. I say this in praise of the gains of literature and not in disparagement of the gains of a profession which I dearly love.' Murray thought that, but for his cloth, he might have been Prime Minister. Murray paid him £250 a quarter, exclusive of any articles he wrote. His rectory brought him £300 a year and he had four sons to educate. Elwin paid high tribute to Lockhart, whom he had found 'so manly and frank, so courteous and kind and generous that nothing can well exceed my esteem for him.' He had often been surprised to see how by the change of an epithet or phrase, he will communicate life and felicity to some dull and commonplace sentence.

Elwin was fastidious. 'Freeman was feeble and diffuse, Croker's style was unpolished, Stanley often missed the mark, Head was tempting but perilous, and Maurice was unsound on the doctrine of eternal punishment.' He felt obliged to rewrite nearly every article he received which cost more time and labour than writing an original paper. He longs for a few clever young fellows and adds, 'Dickens read through

nine hundred contributions to *Household Words*, of which eleven were available after being entirely re-written.'

Lockhart spent the winter with Robert Hay in Rome. He heard Cardinal Wiseman preach a course of Advent sermons, which were oppressively disgusting: 'The audacious presumption of the man's mendacity was astonishing. In private the arrogance of his bearing seems much noticed by the natives.' He died on November 20, 1854 and Elwin took full charge. He got rid of Croker, which Lockhart and Murray had feared to do. Croker had given bitter offence in Paris by a review of the *Memoirs of King Joseph of Naples* and wrote another anti-French and anti-Napoleon article which Elwin refused to accept. Croker adopted a lofty tone and resigned, little thinking that his resignation would be accepted. Elwin lived in a remote country village with no sub-editor or secretary, no public library, bad postal arrangements and poor trains, yet he edited the *Quarterly* successfully for seven years.

Murray vainly urged George Borrow to give the gipsies a rest and bring in some more of his Russian experiences. Sir William Napier, the historian of the Peninsular War, insisted on spinning out the Life of his brother, Sir Charles, the conqueror of Scinde to four volumes and distressed Murray and Elwin by his scurrilities and profanities. He denounced Sir James Outram as a liar and a coward. Murray pointed out that there was material in the book for half a dozen libel actions. He declared that if his advice had been taken the biography would have been one of the three finest in the world and 40,000 copies might have been sold. As it was he dared not publish more than 2,000. John Forster was another 'Tartarly' author who did a good deal of work for Murray, but took his copyrights to Chapman and Hall, who published his *Life of Charles Dickens*. When the crusty old bachelor married Mrs. Colburn, Elwin, who was one of his most intimate friends, wrote: 'Kind, good fellow as he is in a thousand ways, it is rather an appalling



consideration to be shut up in the same cage with him.' Forster afterwards made friends with Murray and left £3,000 to Elwin who was one of his literary executors.

The first edition of Livingstone's *Missionary Travels and Researches* sold out on the day of publication, though it numbered 12,000. It brought the author a small fortune. Murray was extremely sceptical as to Darwin's theory of *The Origin of Species* and thought 500 copies would be all it would be prudent to print. He grew bolder and the whole edition of 1,500 copies at 15s. was disposed of at Murray's annual sale, and a new edition of 3,000 was called for. Bishop Wilberforce, coached by Professor Owen, reviewed it in the *Quarterly*. Darwin thought the article very venomous and manifestly by Owen.

Elwin was not a business man. Correspondence was a grievous burden; manuscripts went astray and the *Review* came out more and more unpunctually. In the summer of 1860 he gave up the editorship. He felt like a man whose term of transportation was over. 'As for the £1,400 a year, I do not bestow a thought upon it. If we can but live, I value all the beyond no more than if it were so much dirt.' His salary was £1,000 with £100 for each of his articles. When he resigned Murray offered him £400 for an article each quarter but he declined the offer. Mr. Paston says he remained a kind of honorary literary adviser to the House for many years. Mr. Macpherson was editor for the next seven years till in 1867 Dr. William Smith came into power. He edited the *Quarterly* for twenty-six years and his Dictionaries and Students' Manuals brought constant honour and profit to Albemarle Street.

John Murray IV came from Magdalen College in 1873. He went on business and pleasure to America and Mr. J. W. Harper said it 'required only a glance to see that he was honest and good and intelligent—and *not spoiled*.' He married Evelyn Leslie, of Warthill, near Aberdeen, in 1878, when his father gave him a share in the business to the extent

of £1,000 a year. Isabella Bird (Mrs. Bishop) was one of their successful authors. Murray invited her to dinner to meet Mr. Gladstone, who questioned her keenly about the Kurdish atrocities. She answered him fully, then turned the tables. 'Now, Mr. Gladstone, you have asked me a great many questions; may I venture to ask you one?' 'Certainly,' he replied. 'Then, what *was* the Nestorian heresy?' He laid down his knife and fork saying, 'Ah, that is a matter in which I am profoundly interested.' For half an hour he expounded the subject, quoting Fathers and critics. He left her amazed at his vast and accurate knowledge and conversance with the whole schism.

Murray used to pay an annual visit to Hawarden, where in 1884 he watched the Old Man cut down a tree. He was wonderfully well and vigorous, talking about anything but politics, though for part of the day at least telegrams were coming in every half hour and most of his time was spent at work in his library. When Mr. Murray left he said, 'How I wish you were out of politics. You would make such an invaluable author; I know you have several books in you.' Gladstone replied, 'I wish sincerely I was—and the day after, be assured, I should retire hither and take up my pen.'

Murray published Darwin's *Life and Letters* and added many royal authors to his list. He delighted to issue *Lux Mundi* which made 'a great stir in the Church.' Hallam Murray joined his father and brother in the firm in 1876. John Murray III died on April 2, 1892, leaving the great business to his sons. Hallam retired in 1908. John Murray IV died in 1928 and his son, Lieut.-Col. Sir John Murray, is now head of the famous firm. Mr. Paston has given us an insight into the world of publishers and authors which is of national interest. Long may the house in Albemarle Street flourish!

JOHN TELFORD.

## PROTESTANT PRINCIPLES AND THE METHODIST CHURCH

**I**N the statement on the doctrinal standard of The Methodist Church in The Deed of Union it is clearly and emphatically declared that the Church as united is Protestant. The form in which this declaration is made is that the Methodist Church 'loyally accepts the fundamental principles of the Protestant Reformation.' I propose in this paper to discuss these 'fundamental principles'—and not merely historically, but in the light of our modern situation.

It will, I trust, be generally agreed among us that it was both well and necessary that in the doctrinal statement such Protestant allegiance should be unmistakably affirmed. In this respect the Methodist Union movement in Britain places itself alongside two union movements shortly prior to it in time—the union of the Congregational, Methodist and Presbyterian Churches in Canada, and the union of the two great branches of the Presbyterian Church in Scotland. In article I, for example, of the constitution of the Church of Scotland it is stated: 'The Church of Scotland adheres to the Protestant Reformation.' In this emphasis, common to the three most recent denominational unions, there is the recognition that the Reformation stands for gains never to be relinquished, for insights to which it were blindness to be unfaithful.

At the same time the affirmation raises issues which are fraught with perplexity, and which demand some kind of elucidation. For it is obvious that so many and so great changes in thought have come during the last few centuries that it is impossible to regard the traditional doctrinal statements of the Reformed Churches as final statements. Loyalty to the principles or essential spirit of the Reformation cannot, and must not, be held to mean that we stand just where the Reformers stood. Humanity does not stand still, however

much we in fearfulness may quake and in faithlessness may shudder; nor does any section of that greater magnitude. As the centuries pass new knowledge reward's man's never-ending search. And for those who believe in the Spirit who guides all faithful inquirers into ever larger and deeper truth there is, in this, the directing thought and purpose of God Himself. There is surely no irreverence in the faith and in the hope that the Church of the Living God, standing on the shoulders of all the past, may in these latter days see a little more clearly or a little further, and be able to state a little less inadequately, the final truth of God in His relation to His world. And such a faith and a hope is abundantly fortified when it is remembered that the Reformation stands for that living spiritual insight which should deliver all institutionalism in religion—the institutionalism of the Protestant Churches included—from the degenerations which so persistently follow in its train. Those who truly understand the Reformation see in it not just a stationary light in an encompassing sixteenth-century darkness, but a search light beam to guide us through the present and the future. And this light calls the Church to the urgent task of simplifying her statement of doctrine, a task requiring the insight which can distinguish between the essential and the secondary.

Where, and how, shall we discover these 'Protestant Principles'? It is not, I would suggest, by a meticulous scrutiny of the detailed writings of the Reformers that we shall come to know them. The leaders of the Reformation differed in many of their beliefs—in, for example, predestinarian beliefs and sacramental beliefs—and these differences were not regarded by them as unessential. Protestantism is something bigger than any of its leaders. Its principles were not always clearly seen by its protagonists. It is in the light of subsequent history that we come to discern the real meaning of the Reformation and to see its relation to the long progress of religion.

Here I shall take Protestant Principles as centring round

three main conceptions; first that of Authority, second that of Faith, third that of Church. These three represent a trinity in unity.

1. AUTHORITY. In discussing 'principles' it is well to begin at the foundation, and it cannot be doubted that the differences between the 'Catholic' system and that of essential Protestantism lead back to the problem of authority. Indeed, the word 'principle' has a special appropriateness to this, the first of the issues to be considered. For though this word is frequently used in the sense of tenet or doctrine, its main or primary meaning is concerned with Ground or Reason. Doctrines are statements of belief: principles are the grounds or reasons of beliefs. The latter is a word of philosophic import, and is therefore appropriate to an age which cannot sever belief from the grounds of such belief.

Many historians of the Reformation have been accustomed to declare that the 'authority' of Protestantism is the Bible. The Infallible Church, as it has often been said, was replaced by the Infallible Book; or, to use the figure under which Sebastian Franck accused the Lutherans, the paper Pope deposed the human Pope. Such statements are not, however, strictly accurate. They are inaccurate both in regard to the 'Catholic' position and in regard to the Protestant position. On the one hand, 'Catholicism' was as much tied to the infallible authority of Scripture as that of later Protestantism. This was clearly stated at the Council of Trent.<sup>1</sup> Nor did the Council of Trent state anything new in this respect. If any one will read the *Summa* of Aquinas he will note how all his propositions are 'nailed down by a text.' Heresy to him consisted as much in denying the historicity of the statement that there was an actual Garden of Eden as in denying the Dogmas of the Church. The position of 'Catholicism,' therefore, was not to deny the inerrant authority of Scripture, but to maintain that there is an Infallible Church to interpret the Infallible Book: or, in other words, that Tradition is

<sup>1</sup> See *Canons and Decrees*: Session 4.



co-equal with Scripture. On the other hand, early Reformers, such as Luther, did not acquiesce in the conception of a uniform authority for all portions of Scripture. To Luther the Bible was to be approached and understood through the Gospel. There was for him, it might be said, a Bible within the Bible. It is not always recognized how revolutionary this attitude of Luther to Scripture really was, nor was this clearly seen by Luther himself. When he called the Epistle of James 'a right strawy epistle,' when he expressed a strong preference for the Fourth Gospel to the Synoptic Gospels, he did not recognize the implications of his individual insight. In other words his mind was of the prophetic, not of the philosophic, order. He saw the Bible with his own eyes, he looked to find what was there and not what Authority said was there. Polemical exigencies led the later reformers to construct, in the interests of logical consistency, a rigid doctrine of Infallible External Authority: and so the 'Fundamentalism' of Catholicism was perpetuated, without however its doctrine of an Infallible interpreting Authority which is its logically necessary counterpart. The illogical nature of what may be called Protestant Fundamentalism is seldom if ever perceived by its modern protagonists. The Bible is a book which consists of many books, but nowhere in the Bible are the books enumerated which should compose it. The Canon of Scripture was decided by the Church, and any one who confers a unique infallibility upon this precise number of books must obviously regard the Church which decided this precise number as itself uniquely infallible. In other words, Catholic Fundamentalism is necessarily implied in Protestant Fundamentalism.

It is however, obvious to every historical student that the Reformers inherited from Catholicism an unhistorical view of Scripture, and if they did not perceive the illogicality of their position, at least they did well in repudiating the conception of an infallible interpreting authority—for of this latter conception they knew sufficient of history to perceive

the fallaciousness. The main fact to be remembered is that the day for a truly historical approach to the Scriptures had not yet dawned; the Reformers, therefore, can hardly be blamed for failing to perceive the unsatisfactory nature of the concept of Authority which they came to promulgate against the still more unsatisfactory concept (in spite of its logical compactness) of Catholicism.

The point, however, I wish to emphasize is that there was that in the earliest Protestant attitude to the authority of Scripture which was the seed-bed of more adequate views. To Luther, Christ was Lord and King of Scripture. He maintained that 'those apostles who treat oftenest and highest of how faith in Christ alone justifies are the best Evangelists. Therefore are St. Paul's Epistles more a Gospel than Matthew, Mark and Luke.' We do not to-day assent to the severance implied in this statement, a severance which impoverishes the Gospel itself; nevertheless, we see in the Gospel criterion which Luther set forth the animating principle of the Evangelical Churches. In the light of this criterion we cannot look to the Bible for a collection of '*dicta probantia*' for the dogmas of the Confessions and other ecclesiastical statements of doctrine. The Bible is a record of a '*progressive revelation*' culminating in Jesus Christ. Its unique importance for us lies in the fact that it enshrines such a revelation; or, if we may use the word expressive of the *human* side of that which is a *Divine* unfolding, in the fact that it contains a record of a continuous religious *experience* which reaches its summit in the experience of 'God in Christ.' This is the essential Protestant message in regard to the Bible. It is not a message of '*infallibility*' with respect to historical and scientific matters: it is a message as to the centrality of the Gospel of the Grace of God in Christ. And this essential Protestant emphasis has been secured, as far as a statement can secure it, by the following sentence which I take from the Deed of Union: 'The Doctrines of the Evangelical Faith which Methodism has held from the beginning and stills holds are based upon the Divine revelation

recorded in Holy Scriptures. The Methodist Church acknowledges this revelation as the supreme rule of faith and practice.' In this emphasis there is a return from Scholastic Protestantism to essential Protestantism, or rather, should we not say, to the Christianity of the New Testament. And it is interesting to note that the last Lambeth Conference maintained a similar position. 'We affirm,' one of the resolutions runs, 'the supreme and unshaken authority of the Holy Scriptures as presenting the truth concerning God and the spiritual life in its historical setting and in its historical revelation. It is no part of the purpose of the Scriptures to give information on those themes which are the proper subject of scientific inquiry. The doctrine of God is the centre of its teaching, set forth in its books by diverse portions and in diverse manners. As Jesus Christ is the crown, so also is He the criterion of all revelation.'

The repeated charge of Catholicism is that the Protestant emphasis is dangerously subjective. This charge, however, is no more true of Protestantism than of Catholicism. We have here a plain statement that the Evangel is to us authoritative. This adequately conserves objectivity. But, it is said, how are we to know exactly what the Gospel is or means? Rome, we are reminded, defines it in her 'infallible dogmas.' Precisely. In point of fact she does so. But the question has still to be considered, on what grounds she does so, and whether those grounds are adequate.

It was, I think, the late Dr. Hastings Rashdall who used to tell the story of a Roman Catholic theologian who said, in reference to a well known Anglo-Catholic whose views were being discussed: 'Yes, he believes every doctrine that we believe, but he believes for the completely irrelevant reason that he believes them to be true.' But if one believes just because the Church has declared one must, the real question upon which one is immediately thrown back is: *why* one confers upon Papal *ex cathedra* utterances the infallibility of absolute truth. One's assent to this is *one's own* assent,

disguise it as one will. 'Il me faut des raisons pour soumettre ma raison.' What is sometimes called 'the right of private judgement' is often regarded as a Protestant principle, and uncritical submission to External Authority the principle of Catholicism. I am not concerned to deny that *in practice* this is so. Nevertheless, submission, or acceptance—choose which word we will—is a personal act: to one who has the status of *man* it is never a mere passive or impersonal acquiescence. The Roman Catholic, therefore, is in the last analysis as much involved in 'the right of private judgement' as the Protestant. And the fact that in practice Roman Catholics accept many beliefs when they know no reasons why they should be true, when indeed they know many reasons why they should not be true, is no rebuttal of this assertion. For External Authority claims not just pragmatic coerciveness, but the absoluteness of Truth itself.

Essential Protestantism places the emphasis not in Institution or in Letter, but in the Evangel of the Grace of God in Christ. This is, if I may use the words, our objective *datum*. This is the Divine Gift, the Divine Word. Methodism, with her essential and abidingly valuable emphasis on 'experience,' must never forget that her primary emphasis must ever be centred on GOD. The very *raison d'être* of the Church is in the Gospel of GOD. Here the descendants of two divergent theological traditions, both Protestant, can meet and, though many perplexing speculative questions may remain to be resolved, together they may rejoice in the Gospel of the Grace of God in Christ.

To this there is, of course, the *human* side. But here, also, the Protestant emphasis is on the *Divine* activity. There is the *Verbum Dei*: and there is the *testimonium Spiritus Sancti*. Space forbids my entering upon the many questions which here arise. Suffice it to say that in the two-fold emphasis of Protestantism—the 'authority' of the Gospel of God once given, and the 'authority' of the inward assurance which grounds itself upon the testimony of the Holy Spirit—there

is a sure guide for those who would seek to stand true to the 'religion of authority' and to the 'religion of the Spirit.' Protestantism, if it understands its own nature, will not be afraid of 'the inner light.' But it will at the same time ever recognize 'the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ' as 'the master light of all our seeing.' *Deus illuminatio mea: In lumine tuo videbimus lumen.* And wherever the Gospel of the Grace of God in Christ is known and seen of men, the Book in which this Message is enshrined and through which it is transmitted will be sure of its rightful place.

II. FAITH. We are led, naturally and inevitably, to what I regard as the second main principle of Protestantism, namely that which is inherent in its conception of Faith. For a discussion of the Ground or Authority of our religion in the Gospel of the Grace of God leads our thought at once to the human recipient of that Gospel and to the conditions, as seen from the human point of view, whereby we make it our own.

The Protestant emphasis on Faith takes us, thus, from the realm of the Grounds of Religion to that of personal religion. Where 'Catholicism' speaks of Faith in the sense of *The Faith*, that is, a body of doctrine to which assent is to be given, Protestantism speaks of Faith in the sense of that personal attitude and activity of heart and mind whereby alone we make God's gifts our own. 'Saving Faith' is not to the true Protestant acquiescence, whether to the legislative or to the doctrinal statements of External Authority: it is the personal appropriation, in trust and in obedience, of the grace and the call of God in Christ. Its test is not whether it makes us toe the line of an infallible orthodoxy, but whether it really delivers from all the enemies which encompass 'Man Soul.' 'The devils also believe,' but are not thereby 'saved.'

This is, surely, the New Testament emphasis, both that of our Lord and that of the Apostles. To Jesus religion consisted in an inner loyalty not in an outward submission.



'Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father who is in heaven.' The test of our real beliefs, and of our real spirit, is the whole life we live. 'By their fruits ye shall know them.' He Himself 'spake with authority and not as the scribes,' who spake from 'authorities' laboriously acquired. And so He made His appeal, both by His teaching and His life, to the fount of personal authoritative insight within men, and not to the outward forms of moral enactment or doctrinal statement. For this reason He spoke in parables, so that those who had eyes to see should see, and ears to hear should hear; and lest men should imagine that an addition to men's information, or acquiescence in abstract formulæ, could lead to life. Or, if we think of Paul is it not because of his central emphasis on faith as the fount of all true religion that he has been recognized as peculiarly the apostle of Protestantism? The kernel of the Gospel to him is a message of Divine Grace, not of meritorious human effort: the core of the Christian life is a personal faith in Christ, a personal experience of union with Christ, revealed in 'the fruits of the Spirit.' Some recent endeavours to make Paul the founder of 'Catholicism' impress me as begotten of an acute myopia. Peering shortsightedly at occasional strokes on the canvas we may fail to see its essential proportions. I cannot but feel that the portrayal of Paul as pre-eminently the 'Hellenistic syncretiser,' or as the founder of Sacramental Catholicism, would have filled the apostle himself with great amazement.

To understand Luther's doctrine of justification by faith, it is necessary to remember the belief and the practice confronting him in the Church. When the need of inward penitence was replaced by the necessity of offering outward penance, when unquestioning obedience to what the Church taught was held to be the one thing needful, when indulgences that could be bought in the street were held to secure what personal piety or faith could not, it was indeed a return to

essential Christianity when Luther said, 'Not by merits or works but by faith.' It is well to remember this if we find—as I suppose we all do—that his conception of 'justification' is inadequate and unworthy. It was because he was so concerned to stress the central gospel message of the Divine boon of Forgiveness that he made too much of the forensic teaching of Paul and too little of his teaching on reconciliation and on union with Christ. Protestantism was significantly impoverished by this forensic notion of justification as a verdict of not-guilty. As a result 'faith' very easily sunk to a mere intellectual assent to the later Reformed doctrines. It was not so to Luther: to him it was an inward renewing experience, as it was to Wesley. Yet it has to be recognized frankly that a forensic conception of justification led to what I might call a forensic conception of faith. For just as courts of law are concerned with formal verdicts, so they are concerned with the outward act, the external submission. And so the Protestant rebellion in the name of Christ returned full circle to the external conception of Faith as found in the 'Catholicism' from which it had departed. When a legal metaphor dominates the mind all our religious conceptions are formed in the legal mould. And so 'faith' once more degenerates to a mere formal submission. This is essential 'Catholicism' disguised by the use of other terms.

Yet when all this is said, as it must be said, about the degeneracy of Protestantism, the real emphasis of primitive Protestantism was on the necessity of a personal faith, an individual insight, an inner obedience. Here there was a return to the New Testament, where we find that religious experience is the fount from which issue all such secondary, though not unimportant, developments as theological statement and institutional embodiment. Protestantism brings all such questions to the bar of religious experience. Or, changing the figure, this is the acid test of their worth: do they minister to personal faith, or do they crush, intimidate

or stereotype it? Are they means, or are they ends? And it is because we would be in the succession of all those who put first things first, who regarded means as means and ends as ends, that we go on saying with Paul, 'By grace are ye saved through faith'—neither through intellectual assent to formulæ, nor through unquestioning submission to ecclesiastical authority.

III. CHURCH. It remains for me to say something about my third principle, and to seek to show the coherence of the essential Protestant message here with the other two principles considered. Again we are led to it naturally and inevitably. For just as from the Objective Ground of religion we were at once led to the subjective means of appropriating or knowing it, so now we are led from this 'faith' of those who have received and known to the Church which is thus formed, which witnesses to this Gospel, which stimulates and sustains this faith.

The order in which this third principle is placed is not haphazard: it is, indeed, an order vital to the Protestant and Evangelical emphasis. First comes the *Gospel of the Grace of God in Christ*—the objective *datum*. Second comes the personal *Faith* by which it is appropriated. Third comes the *Church*, the body of those who have appropriated by faith this Gospel of the redeemed life in Christ, and who are called in the fellowship of this spiritual society whose Head is Christ to fulfil the functions for which it exists.

It will be obvious that this is not the order of 'Catholicism.' There the 'Church' is prior, the Church conceived as a society with a special sacerdotal order and alone able to administer valid sacraments. The priority of the Church is thus the logical issue of this conception of the Church. For if the Church in essential nature is constituted by a sacerdotal order it is obviously conceived as being itself essential to the awakening of the religious faith and life of its members. It has been well said that 'the essential principle of Catholic Christianity is the nourishing of the

religious life by sacraments, which can only be duly administered by a sacerdotal order.'

That the enlightened Protestant and Evangelical Christian places Faith before Church does not mean that he does not recognize that his own faith and whole spiritual life have been mediated to him by the faithful of the past. At least it *should not* mean that. If Protestants forget that historical mediation they are forgetful not only of 'the rock whence they were hewn,' but also of the goal which beckons from afar—a goal, let us remember, which is not the salvation of isolated Christians but of the redeemed spiritual community of mankind. Christianity means and involves Church, just because of the constitution of our common humanity. For it is through the influence of society that we are what we are, and only as we partake and learn of the whole experience of the past can we transmit a larger and worthier experience to the future. And we may, therefore, be certain that so transparent and inescapable a fact would not be here without Divine meaning. The Church, therefore, represents the principle of solidarity, carried to its highest ethical and spiritual reaches. Properly understood there is no 'higher' conception of the Church than this, in comparison therewith the conceptions of sectarian Catholicism are 'low' indeed.

The Protestant, then, must not forget this historical mediation, and must be on his guard against that self-sufficient individualism which is unmindful of our immeasurable debt to the past. Nevertheless, he maintains the priority of Faith because of the very sublimity of his conception of the Church. It is Faith that makes the Church. The richest heritage the past has to bequeath to us is not of forms, of orders, of organization, but of the whole spiritual insight and faith that came to men through Christ. The society which to the New Testament is 'the body of Christ' is not of human making or of human conditioning. 'Flesh and blood' do not make us members thereof, as they do

not reveal to us its secret. It is Faith that makes sacraments 'efficacious': it is not the due or 'valid' performance of the sacred rite that makes Faith.

When, therefore, the Methodist Church claims, in The Deed of Union, humbly but proudly claims, her place in 'The Holy Catholic Church which is the Body of Christ,' she makes no sacerdotal claims for her ministers. Such a claim would be not only a repudiation of her history but also of her essential faith. The only 'apostolic succession' in which she would seek to be is a spiritual succession in which apostolic faith is wedded to apostolic zeal, and manifest in apostolic works. The centre of gravity in Methodism, as in all truly Protestant Churches, is moved from hierarchical organization to spiritual fellowship, from sacerdotal sacramentalism to that personal faith which conditions the reception of the Divine Grace, whether in Word or Sacrament. Her ministers receive at ordination first a Bible, and not a chalice; thereafter they partake of the symbols of their crucified Lord and 'feed upon Him in their hearts by *faith* with thanksgiving.'

The Protestant conception of the Church, therefore, involves what is usually called 'the priesthood of all believers.' Luther, it will be remembered, in his famous treatise *To the Christian Nobility of the German Nation* regarded this New Testament principle as a kind of trumpet note wherewith to blow down the Papal walls 'of straw and paper.' In The Deed of Union the Methodist allegiance to this principle is emphatically stated. Lest there should be any doubt about it, it is affirmed in two separate paragraphs. In one paragraph it is stated: 'Christ's Ministers in the Church are Stewards in the household of God and Shepherds of His flock. Some are called and ordained to this sole occupation and have a principal, and directing part in these great duties, but they hold no priesthood differing in kind from that which is common to the Lord's people, and they have no exclusive title to the preaching of the gospel or the care



of souls.' In a later paragraph we read: 'The Methodist Church holds the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers and consequently believes that no priesthood exists which belongs exclusively to a particular order or class of men, but in the exercise of its corporate life and worship special qualifications for the discharge of special duties are required and thus the principle of representative selection is recognized.'

These are no small or peripheral issues. Nothing less is involved than our conception of the nature of Christianity itself. I cannot forbear here from quoting a vital sentence from a discussion of Reformation principles by a Hibbert lecturer of a generation ago: 'Whatever Church says and means "priest" is on the Catholic side of the great controversy of Christianity; whatever Church says and means "minister," in that act proclaims itself Protestant.'

The tasks confronting the Church of God in these days are many and great; and some consider that in comparison with the urgent *practical* demands the issues dealt with here are unimportant. I do not share that opinion. In the last resort nothing is more important for us than the Gospel for which we stand. The issues which Protestantism raises do not belong to 'old unhappy far-off things'; they are among the living issues of our time. There are not wanting some within the ranks of Protestantism who view the future with doubt, and who in their moments when faith burns low wonder if Newman, after all, may not have been right when he held that the ultimate choice was between Rome and Atheism. Not so have we learnt Christ. It is idle to prophesy, but it may be said that an enlightened, evangelical Protestantism can confront the future with confidence. It is no small matter that the Church of the living God should be able to present the Gospel of the Christian revelation unentangled with superstitions or ecclesiastical tyranny.

C. J. WRIGHT.

## THE PRINCIPLES OF CHRISTIAN SOCIALISM

THE much-criticized phrase, 'Christian Socialism,' finds ample justification in the existence, on the one hand, of a Socialism that is not Christian, and, on the other, of a Christianity that is not Socialist. The term has been described as 'tautologous and unnecessary,'<sup>1</sup> but it can be so regarded only by those who are convinced of the identity of the two. The Pope has recently declared it to be a 'contradiction in terms.' With such differences of opinion it is plain that the phrase serves at least to launch to both Christians and Socialists a useful challenge. The challenge has recently leapt into fresh life in Great Britain by the promotion of a new Christian Socialist Crusade. This has been the work of a company of some twenty-five ministers of religion—mostly Free Churchmen—and twenty-five Christian Labour Members of Parliament, who simultaneously have felt themselves burdened by a twofold concern! First of all, a concern for the Churches. The victory at the polls of the Labour Party and its accession to a measure, though small, of real power, raised the question rather acutely for the Churches as to whether this new force in the nation's life would cherish or oppose Christian ideals. The answer to that question will depend ultimately upon the attitude of the Churches. If the social idealism of Labour is received coldly and treated unfairly, as though it were contaminated by its humble source, the result may be disastrous indeed. With all the talk of political impartiality that pulpit and church indulge so frequently, it is fatally easy for the Churches to become and remain, through sheer inertia, identified with the older politics and the existing social régime. Even where the Church is awake to social problems, so painful an effort

<sup>1</sup>As in a recent Conference of ministers and clergy called by the Christian Socialist Crusade, now merged into The Socialist Christian League.

is often displayed to avoid the label of Socialist, however much the actual wares of Socialist thought are appropriated, as to create a barrier of painful misunderstanding between the Churches and Labour. A Crusade for the re-interpretation of Socialism in Christian terms to the people of the Churches was accordingly felt by these men to be an urgent necessity. But a second concern lay heavily upon their minds, namely, the alienation of the masses of Labour from religious institutions and spiritual inspirations. The toiling crowds of democracy, beset by social misery, are groping in the dark for the ideal social order. The light of faith has been quenched for great numbers of them by the already obsolete materialistic bias of science and by the widely-prevailing cynicism of post-War thought. Hence they struggle on amid the grim shadows of a soul-destroying materialism.

These people are left cold and untouched by a purely individualistic Evangelism that appeals only to a selfish interest in their own precious souls.

For good or ill, these crowds are convinced that they are not receiving a square deal in regard to the means of life, and any evangelism that does not face that problem is for them simply irrelevant. The Christian Socialist Crusade believes it has a gospel for these people, the Gospel of the Saviour *and His Kingdom*, a gospel which extends Divine Grace from the Individual to Society. The Society of Grace is its vision and its challenge, and it seeks by that challenge to break down the materialism that is shutting such vast numbers of Socialists out of the consolation and the dynamic of religious faith. The aim of the Crusade is thus seen to be not primarily political but educational—in fact, it aspires to be an adequate Christian Evangelism. One would think that upon any view of the proletariat Christian people would leap to welcome such an attempt to bring that particular multitude to Christ. If Socialism is 'the end of all things,' then to Christianize it is at least to improve the situation—whereas if it be 'the beginning of all things,' then, again, to Christianize it is to ensure the best.

Driven, therefore, by these two concerns, the Crusade has entered upon an energetic campaign with that well-known Anglican as its President, the Right Hon. George Lansbury, formerly First Commissioner of Works and now Leader of the Opposition in the House of Commons.

In this new movement, which certainly has a difficult task before it, both in the Churches and in the ranks of Socialism, we may recognize the fulfilment of a noble prophecy made in pathetic and, indeed, tragic circumstances. The banner of Christian Socialism was first raised in this country in 1848 by a group of men comprising, among others, J. M. F. Ludlow, the brilliant founder, Frederick Denison Maurice, Charles Kingsley, Thomas Cooper, J. Rayner Stephens, Tom Hughes (of *Tom Brown's Schooldays*) and Vansittart Neale, the father of the Co-operative Movement. These men were touched to the quick by the social suffering of the 'hungry 'forties' and recognized in the protest of the Chartist Movement something essentially Christian. They were specially concerned to preserve the movement from the temptation, held out to it by the precedent of the French Revolution and by the pressure of their own dire misery, to break out in riot and bloodshed, and to lose itself in the quicksands of mere revolt. No one challenged the Chartists on this issue more eloquently than did Charles Kingsley under the pseudonym of Parson Lot, and when at last the little paper started by this group and called *The Christian Socialist* came to an untimely end the dauntless spirit of these pioneers found eloquent expression in Kingsley's poem:

So die, thou child of stormy dawn,  
Thou winter flower, forlorn of nurse;  
Chilled early by the bigot's curse,  
The pedant's frown, the worldling's yawn.

The poem goes on to herald a far off the day when Christian Socialism shall be victorious, and the paper revived.

The Christian Socialist Crusade of to-day is the answer to that brave cry of faith ringing across the years.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> It publishes *The Socialist Christian*.

At long last, in this grim aftermath of the Great War, there is renewed the inspired attempt of the old Chartist days made in the aftermath of the Napoleonic struggle, to give a Christian tone and temper, dynamic and guidance to the People's Cause.

As it is not my purpose to traverse familiar and by now rather hackneyed features of the subject, but rather to set forth the more novel ideas that animate the Crusade, let me treat of the Principles of the new Christian Socialism under two main heads.

I. *Liberty, Equality, Fraternity To-day.*—It is important to see these three ideals springing from the very heart of the Christian Gospel. There is no more shallow reading of the background of the Gospels than the verdict that Jesus had no politics. Not only would it have been impossible for Him, of all people, to be indifferent to the political servitude of the race into which He was incarnated, there is also His definite teaching, which is shot through and through with the results of His close study of the situation. The story of the Temptations, as Stephen Liberty has so well elaborated in his brilliant little book *The Political Background of the Ministry of Christ*, turns upon the problem of method with which the Messiah was faced, and shows Jesus discarding successively the policies of Miracle, Privilege and Revolution. That Jesus chose to pursue a spiritual method of perfect love does not mean that He had no political consciousness or convictions. Rather, such a method was bound to dictate a very decided politic. Accordingly, we find Him uttering a definite verdict in favour of Democracy in the classic passage Matthew xx, where, commenting upon the tyranny of existing Gentile society, He declares emphatically to His disciples, 'Not so shall it be among you.' That the emphasis in this passage upon service and freedom as principles of Christianity is no mere politic but bound up with spiritual salvation is indicated by His further statement, 'The Son of Man came . . . to give His life a ransom for many.' That 'many' makes



the merest bathos unless it means, as it obviously does, the 'multitude' upon whom the 'lords of the Gentiles' 'love to exercise authority,' namely, the mass of the dispossessed, the unenfranchised, those 'sheep without a shepherd' upon whom Jesus had compassion, and for whom He sought to be the 'Shepherd Beautiful.' Here, then, as plain as a pike-staff, are the politics of Jesus bound up with His Cross. We have the inestimable privilege of being able to look back across the centuries and see with what perfect truth He spoke. As H. W. Nevinson has pointed out in his *Growth of Freedom*, true Democracy did not enter the world until the death of Jesus with its *infinite valuation of every individual soul*.

Ever since the liberation of that mighty idea the cause of the common people has been marching, precedent by precedent, into an ever-broadening liberty. The steady percolation of this conception of human value through all civilized society is the deepest root of all the social unrest of the modern world. A new self-respect has been breathed into mankind the world over, and hence 'humanity has struck its tents and is on the march.'

The same Divine Love which insists upon setting all, even the humblest, free (a policy for which the reason is abundantly clear, since no life can become really responsible and educated in self-knowledge and the knowledge of life without such freedom), insists also upon the Equality of all. According to Jesus, every soul is equal in its origin—God, is equal in its cost of redemption—the life of the Son, is equal in its destiny—a child of the Divine Love. Equality, of course, is not sameness. Rather is it based on difference. There must be, of course, enough similarity to make co-operation possible, but if all people were alike, most would be simply superfluous. It is our differences that give us equal value for each other, providing they are not the unnecessary differences that offend and hurt. One is grateful to Mr. R. H. Tawney for his recent brilliant treatment in his book *Equality*,

of the reasonableness and necessity of human Equality. No subject has been more neglected in modern Christian thought and teaching. Let me recommend my readers to it. But neither this liberty nor this equality can be fulfilled without Fraternity. Hence the Saviour's insistence on His disciples' unity in mutual love. Unregulated freedom in a non-equalitarian society can never be true liberty, but must always remain maimed, unstable and cruelly curtailed. This was the mistake made by Liberalism when it lingered in the quagmire of 'Laissez-Faire.' Mere freedom of contract for the majority, with the strategic posts of power kept in the hands of the privileged minority, is the merest shadow of liberty—it becomes a cruel mockery of mankind's deepest hopes. As Tawney exclaims in a brilliant epigram 'Freedom for the pike is death to the minnows.' Equality cannot mean mere 'equality of opportunity,' when there is not equality in resources. To quote another witticism from Tawney, 'The day when a thousand donkeys could be induced to sweat by the prospect of a carrot that could be eaten by one was . . . by the present century obviously long over.' Liberty for men can only be perfected in the Liberty of Man. Self-government by any can only be adequate when all are self-governing. Without a sound Socialism there can be no universal safe and stable Individualism. Nothing is more unfair to Socialism, judged either intrinsically or historically, than the assumption made by Dean Inge and other writers that it is the enemy of individual liberty. Socialism arose historically and rises to-day in protest against the excessive unbalanced liberty of privileged individuals and groups to hold captive and to exploit their fellows.

The conditions of the modern world, however, are making it abundantly clear that without the most complete and determined Fraternity, both Liberty and Equality are reduced to the merest shadow of themselves. The noble battle fought for Liberty by the Free Churches of Great Britain is in danger of being turned to-day into defeat because they have

rested content with intellectual, religious, civic and political freedoms uncrowned by Economic Freedom—the guarantee of equal full resource for every life—without which men are still in bondage, a freedom which can be achieved only by collectivist organization.

To take one main instance of this that must appeal to the Free Churches particularly. Our Puritan and Non-Conformist fathers fought many battles, military and political, to keep 'the power of the purse' in the House of Commons. Where is that power to-day? As long ago as Gladstone's day the great Liberal Chancellor himself complained that it had a tendency to drift towards the City. Are we sure that to-day it is not out of the country altogether? Certainly no answer to the question could be more farcical to-day than 'the House of Commons.'<sup>1</sup> Yet without 'economic' self-government all the boasted unregulated freedom of modern democracy is likely to become little more than freedom to starve in the midst of plenty, unless war arrives first to shorten the agony. Shakespeare knew what he was saying when he declared, 'You take my life when you do take the means whereby I live.' The 'means of life' of the majority of individuals in this or any other 'land of liberty' to-day are only in the faintest degree under their own control. In the main, somebody else holds 'the power of the purse.' Nor is it possible to see how this can be remedied and economic freedom be made a reality without collective control of wealth and money. In other words, freedom that is not 'ordered' freedom is as evanescent as a mirage.

This is becoming so much plainer to the thinking masses—especially since the rise of Modern Communism—that their temper in the situation is likely to become shorter and fiercer, especially in view of the plain contradiction between the super-abundance of wealth, and its parade of luxury, in the modern world and the continuance of abject poverty complicated by the demoralization of increasing unemployment.

<sup>1</sup>Cf. C. H. Hattersley, *This Age of Plenty*.

Yet, could we only see it, the munificence of God in Nature plus Science is the one fact that should ease all tension between the classes, and would do so immediately if our hearts were set upon Fraternity. Nothing should be plainer to the Christian believer than that all God's children have a right to the provision He has made for them, and whilst a corresponding obligation of service attaches to that right, there is no adequate reason to suspect that the obligation would not be generally fulfilled. There is no longer, then, any need for the workers and the classes to eye each other jealously and fearfully as though only by successful rivalry could they secure for themselves a due share of a strictly limited resource. Our antiquated eighteenth-century orthodox economics is saturated with the idea that wealth is scarce. Modern Science in its application to Nature and Industry has exploded that hoary superstition. Given that fraternal spirit which will apply itself courageously, peacefully and perseveringly to the task of World organization, there is no reason to anticipate the pulling down of any decent standard of life and every reason to expect the steady uplift of standards that are at present too low.

It is part of the gospel of the Christian Socialist Crusade to spread this optimistic message, to ease the tension between classes and masses, to enable men everywhere to find in the Love of God, proved by His ample provision for human need, the freedom and courage whereby they may dwell together in unity and concord.

The new age in which we are living is set peculiarly for such Brotherhood. Scientific invention outstripping that of any other period in history since 300 B.C. and making in almost every case for richer human intercourse; an increasing human sentiment encouraged by a more common culture; the helpless need of vast masses of populations—all these things conspire to one Divine end. Only an understanding faith, eager and widespread, is needed now and a determination to be thorough. Thoroughness in Brotherhood, however,

means organization—vast, adequate, efficient, collectivist organization—in a word, SOCIALISM. This is the logic of the essential Christian Gospel.

II. *Conversion, Service, Sanctity.*—The principles we have treated, which formed the battle-cry of the French Revolution, arise out of the Christian gospel from a background of spiritual relationship. Liberty, Equality and Fraternity assume GOD and the Christian God. It is an inadequate psychology that allies them with atheism. Thus, *Liberty* for all assumes the wholesomeness of Life in all. *Equality* assumes Potential Being out of which new value and redemptive forces may emerge to cover present lack, recover deterioration and so equalize personalities up to an acceptable standard. *Fraternity* has no reasonableness or hope whatever unless that Divine potential of being is there. In its absence the truth about humanity is chronic Diversity without a gleam of organic unity *on the scale of the race.*

This Divine Potential accounts for three further principles.

1. *Conversion.*—Plainly, the nature with which man emerges from the jungle is not a socialized one. The very purpose of Nature with Man is to isolate and individualize him. This at its own level is wholesome and good. The making of Individuals is a necessary antecedent to the making of Society. As Benjamin Kidd, in his *Science of Power*, has made so clear, the struggle for life that we see in Nature, with its stress upon self-preservation, is the 'Law that makes the Individual.' By the same token, however, it cannot be therefore the law that makes Society. The Individual made by the one Law must at length submit himself to the working of a new principle—the principle of Self-Giving—if he is to be taken up into true and ultimate Society. The working of that new principle will change his nature—will turn or convert him from self-centredness to otherness. This only is fundamental, biological and *Christian Conversion.* Every human being needs it without distinction. It is fatally easy



to become very refined and educated and civilized, and yet to be essentially jungle-natured. The faith of Christian Socialism is that the Power of God through Christ is available for this necessary change. Nor is it necessary to *wait* for that inward change before adapting Social environment and practice to its nature, *since every such adaptation is an act of evangelism, making it easier for human nature to act upon the higher principles.* By such a double evangelism of teaching and organization mankind would more swiftly draw nearer the goal.

It is important to see the poles of Conversion quite plainly. Christian Evangelism has so often been confused in these. From the Self, isolated in self-interest and concentrated in self-preservation, that is the one pole—to God drawing the Self into an orbit of perfect devotion and relating it beneficently to all others, that is the other pole. Thus, the Individual gains a new and bigger role in life and a new self-hood as Jesus promised. 'Whosoever seeketh to save his life shall lose it, whosoever will lose his life for My sake, shall find it.'<sup>1</sup> The Crusade seeks to promote this definite type of Conversion.

2. *Service.*—Obviously only the Supreme Being can demand and draw forth the full service of men. Most of us would confess that we are not worthy to command the manifold and amazing service our fellows render to us, and yet if such service remains based on self-interest alone it can hardly be its true self and must coarsen in quality. Only as men perceive God and seek to make their lives in every moment and deed an expression of their devotion to Him can true service become possible. Only when it arises in that relationship will it be rich, full, conscientious and wholesomely independent. There will be no lack of the 'mind to work' then. The demand for it will be seen to be too utterly reasonable for any shirking, and yet neither will it be work

<sup>1</sup>For fuller statement, see the present writer's *George Whitefield—the Awakener*. Part IV.

for mere work's sake. The beauty of service will return, since behind it there will be no slave-mind or temper of the driven, but instead, a noble spontaneity born of a belief in God.

3. *Sanctity*.—Unless an eternal value can once more be disclosed in the everyday toil of life, the elaborate and cynical frivolity of the modern spirit will ultimately render social co-operation impossible. An oft-repeated tragedy of social idealism is the way it beats itself to death upon the cynicism of unbelief. If men and women are struggling only for that which is perishable and which, however perfectly it be achieved, must one day pass with the planet into the everlasting death, how can the human spirit be made invulnerable to weariness and despair? A paper Utopia, a merely imagined ideal social régime can never save humanity. Unless the Ideal is seen to be the Real, its power is shorn of securing a lasting and sufficient devotion from man.

But it is the peculiar revelation of God in Christ that His Kingdom is Eternally Real, that Love has organized the Universe and that the present chaos in which we find ourselves is essentially relative to the novelty of our creation, the infantile new beginning that our planet represents. Earth is in process of becoming—Man is the crowning glory of the new creation, but he could not lift his eyes or feel his heart ache towards a Perfect Social Order if the Kingdom of God were not already overshadowing his being and life and moulding to its own pattern his growing world.

The present writer knows from experience of no aspect of the Gospel so thrillingly inspiring for the working masses of our time as this. Their eager reaction from the emptiness of an earth-bound materialistic outlook, with its 'perhaps' and 'possibly' and 'if we are strong enough' limitations of outlook, is pathetic in the extreme. The glory of a faith in the Actuality of the Kingdom as it possesses the Real Universe and stoops to baptize into its own glory this Child of its Creative Power is a revelation to them of the Power of God unto Salvation.

This way lies the return to the act of worship of the working masses of the modern world. Worship must become for them the practice of a new sociality of spirit in adoration of a God of Universal Love, and it must act as a stimulus to the organization of the Social Order if it is to capture their hearts anew.

Sanctity, Sanctity of the Everlasting Reality, for our everyday struggle—in workshop, office, factory, legislature and Parliament—is there any more bitter need of this disillusioned age? This is the crowning message of the Christian Socialist Crusade—its supreme sanction—this Privilege of Divine Benediction upon the greatest of all human quests.

A. D. BELDEN.

*The League on Trial.* By Max Beer. Translated by W. H. Johnson. (Allen & Unwin. 15s.)

This criticism takes the form of 'A Journey to Geneva.' The city is a place of pilgrimage but the twelve years of discussion seem disappointing to the writer. He has ceased to believe in diplomatic secret codes and seeks to produce 'a simple guide to Geneva without mystery-mongering and without pedantry.' This view makes the volume appeal both to friends and opponents of the League. Welcome light is thrown on the offices of the League, its secretariat, its methods and its discussions, by one who has represented a leading German newspaper and himself been a League official. Woodrow Wilson stands out as principal speaker at the banquet, and as 'the prophet of everlasting peace who declared war on Germany,' Clemenceau is 'the conqueror of Wilson and the League.' The Covenant and the Treaty are examined until Geneva is reached, then we enter Hottop's Palace, the hotel which Sir Eric Drummond, the secretary-general of the League, bought as its headquarters. There we watch clerks and hear speeches, and listen to the writer's plea for 'ruthless honesty and self-criticism.' Max Beer regards the League as little more than an instrument to perpetuate the Treaty of Versailles. He will not carry all his readers with him, but he deserves to be heard.

## THE EARLY DEVELOPMENT OF THE ELEMENT OF MYSTICISM

SINCE the written word gave to the mind of man substance and form there have existed writings which shared a certain indefinable quality, and these, in time, came to occupy a definite position in literature. Their characteristic note has been described as 'intimations of a consciousness, wider and deeper than the normal,' and the word 'mystical' has been coined to designate them. 'Mysticism has its origin in . . . that dim consciousness of the Beyond which is part of our nature as human beings.' The 'Beyond' may imply belief in a Personal God. It may refer to a pantheism as indefinable as Shelley's 'Spirit of the Universe' or the vision of the non-theistic Richard Jeffries. Also the 'Beyond' may signify our immediate environment, in which case mysticism becomes 'the art of finding our emotional relationship to the world conceived as a whole' and as such is scarcely what we regard, usually, as a mode of spiritual apprehension. In this article religious mysticism, and that of a particular kind will demand our attention.

The religious mystic is one who claims that his spirit comes into touch with the surrounding spiritual world in much the same way as contact is made with objects in space through the senses. Many mystics would protest against the idea of any faculties being put out of action during the states of mystical consciousness, yet would agree that by some agency, other than the discursive reason, union with the spiritual order is attained. Though he does not deny reason the mystic believes that he transcends it. The difficulty, perhaps the impossibility, of accurately describing any deep spiritual experience has ever been acknowledged. The mystic realizes this but is further restrained by the fear that in attempting to communicate his emotion he may do it violence, 'being so majestic.' The term *μύστης* (*μυσ*,

close lips and eyes) originally implied a vow of silence from the initiate. Inhibition still clings about the word but if the mystic is inarticulate, it is for the reason that he cannot, not that he will not, speak clearly.

Thou, O my God, my life has lighted  
 With ray of light, steady, ineffable, vouchsafed of Thee,  
 Light rare, untellable, lighting the very light,  
 Beyond all signs, descriptions, language.

Professor James enumerates this note of 'Ineffability' as first in the order of his classification of mystical states. A comprehensive definition of mysticism, therefore, can hardly be expected; but of the thousand and one definitions ✓ already in existence, Dean Inge's is perhaps the tersest and most suggestive: 'An attempt to realize in thought and feeling the immanence of the temporal in the eternal and the eternal in the temporal.' The statement is attractive enough, but in aiming at comprehensiveness it would seem to make 'thought and feeling' the media of revelation to the exclusiveness of other faculties of the soul. This does not exhaust Dean Inge's interpretation of mysticism as those familiar with his writings well know, and is only another example of the 'sad incompetence of human speech' to ✓ express the Ineffable.

✓ To appreciate the significance and value of mysticism we must seek our authorities in individuals not only remarkable for the mystical temper but equally for the attainment of the mystical character. The difference between mystical tendencies and the attainment of mystical values should ✓ ever be preserved. The genuine Mystic is one who has reached, or is progressing towards, Reality along the road of Discipline. Mysticism is thus an achievement, not an accident. Nevertheless there are those who may be said to have 'a genius for the Absolute,' so that the Mystic, *sui generis*, would seem to begin life with physical and psychical aptitudes that predispose him to range in a wide field of



consciousness. This bias may be inborn and strengthened by tradition ; but in addition the mystic seems to be endowed with a peculiar kind of temperament. According to some authorities we must also include a consideration of the 'pathological condition' of the 'nervous system' in the mystically inclined. Such recognition of the peculiar make-up of the Mystic need not mark him down as of 'lesser breed': his body, like his soul, may be of finer texture than the average.

Another tendency to be noted in mystical types is the tendency to abnormality; 'the conscious life . . . characterized by an exaggerated and distressing incoherence and instability; and also a great longing for unity.' Prof. Rufus Jones calls attention to the unstable psychic constitution of George Fox before he attained the unification of his nature, a noteworthy statement since in some respects Walt Whitman resembled the great Quaker, and, indirectly, was influenced by him.

An experience common to mystics is the sudden, vivid realization of the 'Whole,' accompanied by a kind of delirious rapture in which either the surrounding world is blotted out, 'fallings from us, vanishings,' or is so completely transfigured as to appear to be shining with celestial light. The technical term for this experience is 'Ecstasy.' The mystic usually entertains a profound respect for his 'Ecstasy,' and is justified when it comes upon him with annunciatory power, opening up a new way and declaring a new mission to be performed. Ecstasy may mark 'the last step of his journey' but it may also come at its beginning. In either case it is of profound significance, being nothing less than 'one fused experience that shall control the courses of his soul.' The psychic flash which enables the Seer to look into the heart of things is prepared for by a long train of previous experiences.

The Mystic's ecstasy is not a mere view of an ordered and beautiful world outside of, and unrelated to, him—a vision

of the Transcendent God—to use a theological phrase; rather is it an actual experience of oneness ‘felt along the blood.’ ‘God and I are one in the act of my perceiving Him.’ In the flight from the alone to the Alone, as Plotinus calls it, the spirit becomes inseparable from the Whole. There is, for the time being, complete adjustment of the psychical machinery whilst a profound and pervading peace and joy are tokens of the soul’s arrival on a higher plane of existence. There is no longer ‘distressing incoherence and instability.’

The ear is self, same with the music  
Beam with vision, eye with sun.

In this exaltation the natural faculties are immeasurably sharpened and intensified. Life loses its temporary nature and bears upon it the mark of indestructability. Immortality, either as the continuance of personality after death, or the absorption into an everlasting Whole, according to theological or philosophical tenets—this is the conviction experienced in Ecstasy. The uniting principle, or active agent, enabling the spirit to become a part of that which it beholds, is Love. The energy of the Love principle and the nature of the object towards which love is directed determines the interpretation which the mystic puts upon the ‘Beyond.’ An intense sentiment of love will tend to make the Mystic’s God more personal and less cosmic. Usually the Mystic’s transport is of temporary duration, rarely lasting more than an hour, though there are notable exceptions to this rule. Even when only of a temporary duration the ecstasy is so powerful as to make definite changes, sometimes of a bodily character, and in any event to make it impossible that life can ever afterwards be quite the same.

Never more the cries of unsatisfied love be absent from me,  
Never again leave me to be the peaceful child I was before.

For the beginnings of Mysticism, we must turn to the home of meditation, India, and the Orient. Here we find

a variety of writings, rich in mystic lore. In the Upanishads the secret is revealed that 'the inner immortal self and the great cosmic powers are one.' This revelation is shared by members of the 'Open Secret Society of Mystics' the world over; for, as Dean Inge had said, there is unanimity, among Christian, Pagan, and Mohammedan, regarding 'the vision of the One' and the 'ecstatic love of the Absolute.' Such identity we expect from a mode of apprehending Reality that claims 'immediacy.'

Plotinus, who came from Alexandria to Rome in A.D. 244 is, for our study, the significant figure in Western civilization. Though not the first to carry forward the tradition, he is the most thoroughgoing of Western Mystics. On four separate occasions Plotinus attained the goal of his aspirations—the ecstatic union with the Absolute. It was not this achievement alone that has given to his name an almost unimpeachable authority, but his insistence, both in his teaching and by his example, on the inclusion of moral and intellectual effort in the pursuit of the highest truth. Plotinus was a man so remarkable that we regard him rather as a phenomenon than as a personality. 'If Plotinus had been studied with half the care that has been bestowed on Plato and Aristotle, the continuity of philosophical and religious thought in the early centuries of the Christian era would be far better understood, and the history of Greek Philosophy would not be habitually deprived of its last chapter.'

Did Plotinus derive his Mysticism from Oriental teachings? The question is of some importance, for whenever there is marked likeness between Western and Eastern Mysticism, the direct influence of the East upon the West is often claimed. Rabindranath Tagore has commented upon the extraordinary similarity between Walt Whitman and the Oriental Mystics. However, as far as Plotinus is concerned, the sources of his inspiration do not seem to have been derived from the East. The most important influence on his life came from a self-taught working man, at whose feet

Plotinus sat for ten years. His name was Ammonius. For his teachers and the groundwork of his philosophy he went back to Plato and Aristotle, and 'there is little more evidence of an Oriental strand of influence in Plotinus than there is in Plato, in spite of the difference between the cosmopolitan character of the third century Alexandria as compared with the Athens of the fourth century B.C.'

In all forms of mystical religion there are features and complexions that group their individual exponents in one or other of the various categories. Whether or not Plotinus perfected his mystical philosophy in independence of any other system, there is in the *Enneads* a closer resemblance to some Indian philosophies than to Christianity. The flesh and blood relationship inevitable in the worship of an Incarnate Deity, is notably absent in Plotinus. There is a consideration of significance when we remember that for ten centuries Christianity was threatened with erosion from the tides of Neo-Platonism, a form of philosophical Mysticism which turned aside from the material to seek, through a divine darkness, the 'light that never was on sea or land.' 'The whole character of the Mysticism of Plotinus is affected by the fact that the ideal object of the quest is a state and not a person. At no point in the ascent is God conceived of as a Person over and against our personality. . . . He is no longer a Person but an atmosphere.'

If Plotinus is little indebted to the Orient, the stream of European Mysticism can be traced back to him as its source. Not without reason has Plotinus been described as 'the father of Western Mysticism.' It was this Alexandrian philosopher who collected the sacred treasures of Greece and blended them with his own thought and revelations; and though he has ignored Christianity, Christianity has in no sense returned the compliment. The earliest works of Augustine are steeped in Plotinus. After the Bishop of Hippo, some unknown Greek scholar, writing under the pseudonym of Dionysus, converted the works of Plotinus into an elaborate

form of Christian Mysticism, and Meister Eckhart in the thirteenth century, became the fountain-head for these various mystical streams which had been flowing in Europe. He may be regarded as the 'culmination of Neo-Platonized Christian Mysticism.' But whilst he may have been the culminating point of Neo-Platonism he did not exhaust its energy—it overflowed and found a receptacle in a little volume entitled *A Book of Contemplation, the which is called—the Cloud of Unknowing, in which a Soul is oned with God.* The date of its composition cannot be later than the fifteenth century, and its anonymous author has given 'the first expression, in our tongue, of that great mystic tradition of the Christian Neo-Platonists.'

Sentences and idea picked out at random echo Plotinus. 'God,' says our anonymous spiritual director, 'may well be loved but not thought.' Of the higher stages of mystical contemplation the writer tells us that 'it hangeth all wholly in this darkness and in this cloud of unknowing; with a loving stirring and a blind beholding into the naked being of God Himself only.' Again, 'there never was yet pure creature in this life, nor yet shall be, so high ravished in contemplation of the Godhead, that there is not evermore a high and wonderful cloud of unknowing between him and God.' Thus we get back to the God of Eckhart—'The Nameless Nothing, the empty desert where no one is at home.'

It will be apparent, then, to what extent Mysticism, until the fifteenth century, had come under the influence of Plotinus, and it will be equally obvious what radical changes would have to appear in its development before it could become wholly acceptable to Christian thought.

J. H. BODGENER.



## NEW THOUGHT ON THE ATONEMENT

THE literature dealing with the doctrine of the Atonement is so large and varied that it might seem as though every possible view had been canvassed, and that there was neither room nor need for a further book on the subject. Evidently, however, that is not the opinion of Mr. Leon Arpee, for in the volume<sup>1</sup> which he has just issued he regards himself as having something new to say and attempts to say it. He proclaims his dissatisfaction with all existing theories, and from that point of view he announces his book as a critical study. But his aim also is to be constructive, and there the claim he puts forward is that the key to the solution of the problem is to be found in experience. He seeks to bring psychology to the aid of theology, his contention being that the vicarious nature of Christ's sacrifice can be justified and interpreted thereby. How far he makes good that contention remains to be seen.

The discussion as a whole is divided into three sections under the general headings of 'Man in sin and repentance,' 'God in the act of redemption,' and 'The ministry of reconciliation.' Each main subject is also broken up into sectional discussions. The general impression left on the mind is that Mr. Arpee's treatment of 'Man in sin and repentance' is the most satisfactory and convincing portion of the book. He rightly insists that sin, in the final analysis, is to be interpreted in terms of personal relations. It is an offence of a person against a Person, the son acting otherwise than he should towards his Father, the seriousness of the offence being aggravated by the gracious character and disposition of the being against whom it is directed. Hence there is alienation between man and God, so that whilst as sin the offence requires forgiveness, the corrective of the

<sup>1</sup> The Atonement in Experience: A Critical Study. By Leon Arpee. (Allen & Unwin, Ltd.).

estrangement must be reconciliation. Both are necessary for the restoration of the sinner's true standing before God. The path to that restoration lies through repentance and faith. Mr. Arpee gives us a useful discussion of those terms. He criticizes effectively Moberly's interpretation of repentance. Moberly, while rightly holding that there can be no forgiveness without forgivableness, regards the latter as supplied by repentance, which, however, he interprets as an initial righteousness, deserving, therefore, only a forgiveness which is initial, and which does not become complete till the righteousness is complete. It is a strange doctrine of forgiveness, which, as we believe, is at the moment it is granted as full as it is free. Nor is righteousness, initial or complete, one of its conditions. Those are repentance and faith. In them righteousness as an actuality is absent; they merely hold open the door to it. Repentance surveys the past, sees the sin in it in some measure with God's eyes, echoes the divine judgement upon it, condemns and regrets it. It is a mood of the soul composed mainly of thought and feeling. The element of will, of course, enters into it, as it does into all psychological processes, but that appears mainly in a new orientation of the personality towards the claims of goodness. Obviously no repentance for the past would be genuine which did not include that changed attitude to the future. But that is not righteousness achieved; it is only righteousness contemplated and desired. Moreover, whilst a necessary ingredient in true repentance, it is more dominantly present in that other condition of forgiveness, viz., faith. Here, again, Mr. Arpee's exposition moves on true lines. Methodist theology has spoken of two kinds of faith as involved in the experience of salvation—the faith of adherence and the faith of assurance. Of these the former is much the more important. The faith of assurance is not a condition of forgiveness, but operates as its sequel. It is the mystic insight of the soul, wrought within us by the operation of the Holy Spirit, by which we know, when

forgiven, that God has indeed spoken to us the forgiving word. The faith of adherence, however, precedes forgiveness. It is faith in the sense which St. Paul has in mind when he speaks of our being justified by faith. It is a term which has often been imperfectly understood, even in Methodism. The faith that saves (or, more correctly, is the condition of salvation) is in its promise a wonderfully ethical thing. It is the movement of the whole personality towards God in love and surrender, the mind to realize His holy will, the feelings to love Him, the will to trust and obey Him; and this last, the downstooping of the will in surrender to the claims of goodness and the will of God, is the supreme element in that act of faith. It is that element at its heart which safeguards ethical interests and enables God, in and from the moment of forgiveness, to regard us no longer as the sinners we have been but as the saints we have committed ourselves to be, to look at us, in Augustine's great phrase, 'not as we are, but as we are becoming.'

One point on which Mr. Arpee insists is that the reconciliation which attends forgiveness is mutual, i.e. it is of God to man as well as of man to God. It is quite true, as he says, that the Biblical exhortation to be reconciled is generally addressed to man, because the practical difficulty in the way of reconciliation lies on man's side. Of God it is always true that 'He waits to be gracious.' Yes, but He 'waits,' and necessarily so, for the favour of God obviously cannot flow out upon the sinner persisting in his sin as it can, when in penitence he seeks the divine mercy. Hence the estrangement affects both sides, and the reconciliation is mutual. Where we feel that Mr. Arpee's presentation is less satisfactory is in his treatment of love as it is concerned with punishment. To quote his words, 'He who would punish to any high and helpful purpose, must usually at the same time "punish" himself, even as the New England minister banished his wayward son to the garret for the night, only to creep up in the darkness to lay himself down

alongside the offender in a fellowship of a common sorrow.' Quite frankly, we do not think the suggested analogy a happy one or true to what man's sin involves to God. It is a confused use of the term 'punish.' Man's sin involves suffering for God; it is a grief to Him as well as an offence against Him, the latter because of God's holiness, the former because of His love. Love in the presence of sin means suffering. Love always has to pay for being love, and the greater the love the greater the suffering. But the suffering which sin entails upon the sinner is different in its quality and content from that which his sin brings upon God. The sinner's suffering is punitive in quality; it is chastisement, the fact and the sense of the divine displeasure, the relegation of the son to the garret. The divine suffering is distress of spirit caused by horror of sin and an acute realization of all the hurt that is wrought by its committal to the son whom the Father cannot help loving even when he sins. That is a point on which we feel that a more careful analysis would have been wise.

The second section of Mr. Arpee's book is concerned with the contribution which God brings to the achievement of man's salvation. 'Redemption,' as Canon Simpson has remarked, 'is the work of God or it is nothing.' Hence for the Atonement to be effected through Christ there must be the incarnation of God in Him. The Incarnation is the prelude to redemption—but not, as the old Greek Fathers regarded it, the redemption itself. Moreover, if we are saved not by a transaction but by a Saviour, our thought must not linger at the Cross, but must pass beyond it to Christ risen, and it is to a living Saviour that all our faith and hope must cling. But if His saving power is rooted in the Cross, it must be because there the full character and disposition of God in their bearing upon human sin came to expression. Sin came to judgement in the Cross, was exposed as the foul and wicked thing it really is. That the Cross should involve this was demanded by the moral perfection

of God. But there was love also in it; only part of God would have been there otherwise. We do not reach the inner secret of the Cross until, as Isaac Watts enjoins us, we come in our contemplation of it to where we

See from His head, His hands, His feet,  
Sorrow and love flow mingled down.

Yes, sorrow and love, because it is sorrow begotten by love. It is the suffering of the loving heart in the presence of sin—the suffering of God. For we must not let the imagery which Watts employs beguile us into thinking that the redemptive suffering of Christ on the Cross was physical. Bodily suffering was there and of a most excruciating kind, but that was but incidental to a deeper anguish of soul, and it is in that phase of suffering that the Cross becomes a window through which we see into the very heart of God.

But in the foregoing sentences I have been expressing my own thoughts more than Mr. Arpee's, though we are both in agreement as to the true nature of Christ's passion. 'The sufferings of Gethsemane and Calvary,' he says, 'in their deepest depths did not reside in the flesh. They were of the spirit. And it was God in Christ that endured them.' I confess, however, my inability to follow him when he says, 'In the Cross God made Himself forgiving by asserting His own righteousness.' 'How,' he asks, 'could the divine Father in His mercy offer to the sinner *free* forgiveness without thereby compromising His own righteousness?' Well, if the Cross means God making Himself forgiving, the Psalmist must have been sadly astray in his theology when he said, 'For Thou, Lord, art good, and ready to forgive, and plenteous in mercy unto all them that call upon Thee,' and Nehemiah in saying, 'Thou art a God ready to pardon,' stands in the pillory with him. Did those Old Testament saints so utterly misconceive God? As to forgiveness being free, it is never so in the sense of being unconditional. But the conditioning elements are on the side of man, and we have already con-



sidered what they are. When those conditions are met, the waiting grace of God becomes free to outflow. That is an eternal fact of the divine nature. The Cross did not create it; it revealed it. In other words, the Cross did not make sin forgivable; it revealed how forgivable it was when the right conditions were present. Mr. Arpee, when he turns to the Old Testament, seems to have eyes only for the Law and the sacrifices it prescribed; what some of the greater prophets say about those same sacrifices he passes over in silence. He is surely incorrect, too, in asserting that the Last Supper which our Lord shared with His disciples in the Upper Room was not a Passover meal. It was undoubtedly an anticipation in time of the usual occasion, because of the fate which Jesus believed to be immediately awaiting Him, but that it was in its character the Passover, apart from being suggested by 'this' in Luke xxii. 15, is proved by vv. 11, 13 which precede. That too our Lord shared in the meal is evidenced in Mark xiv. 20. It is true that the primitive Church did not take over the Passover feast from Judaism, but only perpetuated in its ritual those eucharistic elements which marked the close of the Last Supper in the Upper Room, but it did not need Mr. Arpee's faulty exegesis to supply justification for this act of discrimination.

In the third and last section of the book we have the author's own attempt at a constructive doctrine of the Atonement. He repudiates the idea that the Atonement is a mystery, and he urges not only that it should be preached, but that it 'is the one thing in the world that can and must be preached.' Such preaching, however, to be effective with the average hearer, must be intelligible, and we confess that we are not greatly convinced that this is done when, as an instance of how some discredited traditional view, if varied in the form of its presentation, may win understanding and acceptance, Mr. Arpee writes: 'Say, "He paid His life a ransom to the devil," and your hearer promptly resents it. Put it this way: "He surrendered His life to the powers of evil in

order to save His moral Saviourhood," and you carry your hearers with you.' One might say of that suggested alternative statement what a wit, turning to Latin verse for his medium of expression, said of an address on "Lucidity" which Matthew Arnold, in my boyhood, delivered in Liverpool:

*Heu! tua luciditas luciditate caret.*

Mr. Arpee does not believe that sin is to be remedied by its denunciation. That he regards as having been the method of the Old Testament prophets, and he dismisses it as futile, as often as not stirring the sinner to anger instead of melting him to penitence. That may be so if denunciation exhausts the preacher's message. But to say that the apostles in their preaching abstained from denunciation, but simply 'without bitterness held up the Cross of Christ,' is to forget the stinging words with which Peter, on the Day of Pentecost, lashed the consciences of his hearers; to forget too that the apostle could claim, if he had been challenged, that he was but imitating what had been on occasions the tone of his Master before him. The Cross is judgement as well as salvation, and to fail to present either aspect is to be untrue to its tremendous significance.

But what is the positive theory of the Atonement which Mr. Arpee has set out to propound? We find it, when he comes to state it, to be a new translation of the term 'vicarious.' Whether it is a legitimate one remains to be seen, but there is one premiss which enters into his argument which we feel bound to challenge at once and outright. He says that 'the difficulty regarding a transference of guilt is a creation of the study rather than of the pulpit.' Then that must be because the pulpit has often been divorced from the study. That a certain type of evangelism has so presented the work of Christ and that such preaching has been attended by conversions is no conclusive argument for the truth of that presentation. Happily we are not saved by a theory of the Atonement, but by the Christ who atoned, and to

bring home to men in any way that the Cross is a revelation of the forgiving grace of God, and that the guiltiest of sinners can in penitence and faith cast himself upon that grace and be forgiven, is to preach a saving Gospel. But though it is true that the forgiving grace is the main thing rather than any theory which accounts for it, any attempt at a theory should not offend either the mind or the conscience. The notion of a transfer of guilt does both. Guilt means, as regards a particular act of sin, that I committed it. The act was mine, and so the guilt of it is mine too. The two are inseparable. You can no more transfer the guilt than you can transfer the act, and it is simply slipshod thinking which makes any one think otherwise.

But we leave that point and come to Mr. Arpee's explanation of 'vicariousness' as exhibited in the death of Christ. It is a somewhat unusual interpretation. To put it largely in his own language, the Cross represents the climax of human sin. It was a sin so awful that God's wrath burned at its hottest when men nailed His only Son to a cross. 'But, infinite wonder! God restrained His wrath in the Cross, and instead of inflicting, He chose to endure suffering. The wrath in the Cross stopped short at the Cross. God held His punitive anger in leash and let His Son die *instead* (is there a better word?) of His murderers.' In other words, passive submission to wrong was substituted for resistance to it and punitive action. 'The wrath which could have instantly destroyed the murderers . . . suffers itself to be murdered.' This is supposed to justify the redeemed sinner in saying: 'The wrath of God was on the crucified one; Christ bore my sins and endured my death, that I might escape the judgement of hell.' Such is what Mr. Arpee would have us understand by the 'vicariousness' of the Atonement. What are we to say concerning it? In the first place, it presupposes the actual nailing of Christ to the cross, for there could be no wrath unless the offence calling it forth had first been committed. The offence precedes the

wrath and evokes it. Next, wrath in God denotes His disapproving judgement of a certain piece of conduct. The wrath is not vindictive, but it does involve, negatively, the withholding of favour, and, positively, condemnation of the sin and the loosing ultimately, if not at the moment, of the penalties which attach to it. Was that normal procedure of God set aside at the Cross? There must have been from the very nature of God a disapproving judgement—or wrath (to use the Biblical term)—at that crime of crimes. Upon whom did it rest? On Christ? or on His murderers? That Christ should have been in any sense that words can express an object of God's wrath is unthinkable. Surely He can never have been so fully the object of His Father's good pleasure as when He was carrying to the ultimate His fulfilment of the Father's will. And what was Christ's own reaction to the sin of His crucifixion? Did His passive submission to it mean any diversion of its penalty? Nay, was it not one of the poignant sorrows of His closing days that He saw so clearly what His rejection was going to involve for Jerusalem and the Jewish nation. 'Behold your house is left unto you desolate,' 'Weep not for Me, but weep for yourselves and for your children'—these are premonitions of judgement. With every desire to appreciate Mr. Arpee's interpretation of 'vicariousness,' we have to confess that it remains perplexing to the mind and does not ring true to the conscience. There we leave it.

A. LEWIS HUMPHRIES.

*Analecta Bollandiana* (Tomus L. Fasc iii and iv) Père Delehaye prints the Greek and Latin texts referring to 'S. Romain Martyr d'Antioche' with additional matter drawn from Chrysostom, Severus of Antioch, and the poems of Prudence. His fête was fixed in antiquity for November 18. Other papers describe 'A Posthumous Miracle of S. Marti nat Chablis'; 'S. Bassus, the martyr bishop honoured at Nice,' the office of S. Julien of Rimiai. Occasion is taken of the 1500th anniversary of St. Patrick's mission to Ireland to issue an unpublished narrative from the Franciscan Library in Dublin. The codex is miscellaneous and seems to belong to the fifteenth century.

### 'EXCEPT THE MAN HIMSELF'

WE have been lately recalling that the father of English psychology, the founder of Experientialism, John Locke, was born just 300 years ago: 'that modest man,' as Voltaire wrote, 'who never pretends to know what he does not know.' And we have perhaps been reminded how, to the Experientialist dictum: Nothing is in mind (*intellectu*) which will not first have been in sense, Leibniz rejoined with *Nisi ipse intellectus*: except the mind itself. It is as if he said: You may pitchfork out of you your real 'nature,' but it will turn up again within you: *tamen usque recurret*. (Horace's *naturam*, in his adaptation of the pitchfork proverb, was not 'your real nature,' but we can in turn adapt it.)

Now it is for me not without significance, that among all the many eighteenth-century critics of the new Experientialism, or Sensationalism, of whom my Englished Ueberweg's *History of Philosophy* gives a précis, I do not find one who improves on Leibniz's rejoinder in the terms of *nisi ipse homo*. So strongly does the vigorous bantling of British psychology, aided by the myopic scepticism of Hume, appear to have led aside the thought of our land, from Locke's age till the present day. So far as I know, there has been from then till now but one voice crying to us in the wilderness of our sensationalistic psychology—that of James Ward in 1885—that we were as ostriches hiding our head in the sand (or is it a bush?), in our blindness to the fact, that unless *ipse homo*, the Self, be on the stage, our mind-analysis is meaningless.

Experientialists have rallied to Locke's defence, and have shown that in effect there is plenty of the congeries called 'intellect' in his sensationalism. But they have not equally contended, that Leibniz's rejoinder has no real force. There is nothing given by intellect that can truly be called those 'necessary truths,' which sense could not give, namely, that



whereas in sense we have the proposition 'S is P,' in these we have 'S must be P.'<sup>1</sup> For intellect is unable to fill the place of that unique factor in experience: the experiencer, the valuer. It is but a name for a number of mind-ways, or mind-ings, by which man reacts to the impressions which he, as being alive and intelligent, is 'willing' to receive. He alone is the inexpugnable 'I' who experiences. And if you get lost in your 'stumbling' upon this and that 'perception,' and doubt whether he actually is, it must be you, the inexpugnable you, who are the doubter.

It does not matter as to the *word* wherewithal we clothe this indisputable, this 'necessary' factor. We may use the representative 'we' for the 'I'; we may use the royal 'we' for the 'I.' Ultimately it is I-who-experience,-who-value,-who-judge. We may eliminate the pronoun: an apparently easy matter in some languages (I say, apparently, for the pronoun has a way of peeping out in the inflection), but we cannot pitchfork that which is behind the word. A queen may say, in a now classic flout: 'We are not amused.' But she meant, that 'I, the appraiser of your anecdote, as reported to my senses, as tried by my taste, my *savoir faire*—these being the instruments, the 'mindings,' by which I judge—I decide that you do not amuse me.

If she had said, 'There is the opinion that no amusement has arisen,' we should no longer have had something fundamental and unique: the expression of the 'nature' of this particular woman, given in a personal opinion, not shared with any one else. We should be left with the very *homo* who shot the dart ejected, and only the mind-way of impression and reaction left to replace her or him.

Now this was what Buddhism gradually came to do, as it drew, in time and in place, in its point of view, ever further from its original inspiration. I have described this tragedy, briefly or at some length, in book and article for more than

<sup>1</sup> G. Croom Robertson, *Elements of General Philosophy* (edited by the writer), 1896.

seven years. I was under no illusion that, in presenting a historic picture of the matter to readers who had till then been shown the usual unhistorical picture, I should 'draw all men after me.' It is true that I have since found myself in good company: e.g. in that of Edmond Holmes, who, though a reader of translations only, refused to see aught but a libel on the Founder of Buddhism in the dogma, that the very man—the soul or spirit—is not real; and in that of James B. Pratt, who, similarly limited in reading, had come to the same conclusion. But I have yet to find that I have converted readers anywhere, especially writers on Buddhism. These, with those two exceptions, have already committed themselves to the unhistoric view of 'primitive Buddhism,' as upheld by certain formulas, on which adherents base their belief. There is something to be said for an older man's unwillingness to own he has something to learn. But he must first find out he has something to learn. To find out, he must read, or he must hear what his critics are saying. Nor even then will he be disposed to concede, that to accuse Buddhism of 'starting with the negation of the soul or ego' is to deny at once the possibility of its having ever become, with such a mandate, a world-religion. Especially in India! But this is what writers, especially mature writers persist in saying. So I—'Lo! we turn to the Gentiles': to the younger men and women, and in my hope in them, 'fed up,' as they may be, with this irrationally nihilistic repetition, I once more in different setting say what hereon I have said already. It is worth repeating. It will one day be the way in which we shall value the old Indian gospel now called Buddhism.

The very man (soul, ego) was 'expelled with a fork':—that I grant, yea, grant it more fully than they who seek some less irrational compromise are willing to admit. I grant it fully because I happen to have a little knowledge of what Hīnayāna writers of the fifth century A.D. said. And albeit these works are now accessible as never before, very few inquire into them. But the expulsion took a long time. We must

get well away from 'primitive Buddhism' if we would place the descent in true perspective. There was even in early days a slipping here and a slipping there, but there was for perhaps nearly two centuries no *dégringolade*, no subsidence by a general worsening. And it was probably only in the exotic daughters of the Sakyan gospel, in S. Asian lands, that the fall reached its nadir. The *Milinda Questions* show, however, even discounting much Ceylon editing, that already in India there had been pitchforking of more than the Divine Soul as within man. Man (or soul) somehow there was, but, as in the Kathāvatthu,<sup>1</sup> he could only 'be got at' in mind.

But to-day I dwell not on the pitchfork, but on the *tamen usque recurret*. How did man come right back again? Or more truly, how did he never really get pitchforked, save only in formula?

Buddhism could cast him out in formula, in creed, in theory, but she could not cast him out in language, and therewith in all that language implies. Very plastic is the word, in its changes, its fissions, its permutations, its blending of roots. But there are limits to its plasticity. Man cannot wholly expel himself from his speech—or at least he never does. He may hide himself in some languages more than in others. We of Europe have to learn that in some, to say 'I do' is to be very emphatic in 'my' having done anything. We learn this of course in our classics, but we forget it when we translate Indian tongues. I have already called to notice the surviving traditional ascription to the Founder of Buddhism of the frequent use of this emphatic 'aham'; 'I,' as if he had a premonition of the way in which his followers would make him deny that which, as supreme mandate, was so present with him.

What do I mean by supreme mandate?

In a portion of the Canon which we may fairly value as early is a Sutta completely overlooked by books on Buddhism.

<sup>1</sup> Translated as *Points of Controversy*. Pali Text Society, 1915.

It is called the Three Mandates (*ādhipateyyāni*: what belongs to the *pati*, or master). In it the man has begun 'in faith' to take his conduct seriously, but is troubled over his want of progress. He takes to heart one of three mandates, or two, or all of them. These are (1) *the Self*:—the ideal self within, Witness of all he does or does not do; (2) *the Worthy* in this and other worlds who may be watching him and wondering he is no better; and (3) *Dharma*, that monitor of the Ought, that 'conscience, ay, that Deity within my bosom,'<sup>1</sup> here presented (in true Indian fashion) as his mate in the holy life admonishing him. Here truly for me is 'primitive Buddhism.' But how we are to reconcile it, given the Indian teaching of 6-500 B.C., with 'negation of the ego' I am at a loss to conceive. Here are India's supreme mandates.

Even without the *aham*, the 'I' peeps out in verb-inflections, e.g. *karo-mi*, *ei-mi*, *mon-eo*, &c. Everywhere in self-expression has the man, the agent, the experiencer, the valuer, left his traces. And the only way to oust him in theory is to make out, as does the Buddhist philosophic teacher, that man doesn't really mean what he says. That when he says 'I,' he would have us take the word only as true:—as 'conventionally true,'<sup>2</sup>—not the thing behind the word. That to become really wise, you must at the threshold strip off from the word the entire history of man's efforts to express himself in words, and see, in these, mere labels of something that isn't just 'man.'

But there was another way, beside that of the pronoun, as distinct from, or merged in the verb, by which the expelled man came back—and still comes back. Very gradually Buddhism came to resolve the 'man' into what we now call a complex. This was at one stage (and it lasted long) of five factors, bodily and mental, known as *skandhas*. Then it became enlarged into 50 to 60 *dhamma*'s, the word 'things' here taking on a psychological meaning of 'things-as-known,'

<sup>1</sup> Shakespeare's *Tempest*.

<sup>2</sup> The late Buddhist technical term.

our 'states of consciousness.' And the permutations of these *dhamma's* amounted, of course, to any number of shifting complexes in the fleeting mental continuum into which the 'man' had faded. But look! man's inexpugnable intuition of him-'self' saw, in this conscious series, some relatively persisting *dhamma* in which, or for which other *dhamma's* happened in groups. Such a *dhamma* would be called usually *chitta*, or *mano* or *viññāna*, i.e. mind. And one or other of these three we often find posturing as the 'man' or ego, e.g. mind as reacting to sensations, or receiving and valuing an incoming complex of impressions. So the text. The commentary, that is, the expounding teacher will illustrate by making the man 'come back.' Thus, the mind is like a *king* to whom villages pay revenue; the mind is like a prodigal *prince* receiving envoys from his father.

And not the mind as a whole only. To this and that constituent complex of mind will be allotted desires and activities, fit only when applied to the central 'subject' or man. Faith, we read, arrests hindrances, effort supports other *dhamma's*, wisdom cuts off, splits. . . . It may be said: But such play with words, such anthropomorphic diction is surely a frequent feature in literature and deceives no one. Do we not find it, for instance, in the Upanishads? For instance in Chāndogya VII: 'Earth . . . space . . . mountain are musing . . .'

This is true; but note how relatively restrained is such diction as we there meet with. And why? The man is ever coming up to take over the agency, the human self, the divine self. 'Earth, as it were, muses (*dhyāyati*) . . . atmosphere, sky, water, mountains muse as it were . . . he who reverences musing as Brahman, he becomes boundlessly free.' And so on.

In the Buddhist texts we do not in this way walk beside the man. We only see him in his dummies. It is only in what I call the 'left-ins'—a most fortunate collection of, shall I say, accidents?—that we see the man not yet ejected



dominating in the text itself the parable, the simile. The Way, the Middle Way of the first utterance was taught with the wayfarer in such scanty fragments as survive. What meaning has way if wayfarer be not there? Yet in the scholastics we repeatedly find the way said to be without wayfarer. The man has indeed been expelled when that could be written. Sariputta is repeatedly shown comparing man's worthy control of his thoughts with one who takes, on different occasions, suitable garments from his wardrobe. Here have we indeed the man, not body, not mind, still holding the stage. It was only the later values that represented the garments as no other than the wearer of them.

It is rather lamentable to see how, not only Buddhists but we, who have written on Buddhism, have sought passages which buttress the church-made dogmas, but have neglected these 'left-in's.' These, the *original* Buddhism, reveal a different, an Indian standpoint, which aimed at 'supplementing, not at supplanting' the religious thought<sup>1</sup> of the day. How is it that this irrational expulsion of the 'man' has by almost all readers been found reasonable? Is it perhaps that we have inherited, in our own young psychology, a similar slovenly usage? Usage which we may tolerate in poetic or 'elegant' literature becomes anathema where sober truth is aimed at. But in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, there was no 'mental and moral science,' no listing of the 'psyche' under the analytic 'ologies.' Man's immaterial world was considered as the philosophy of literature, and discussed with the tropes and embellishments of literary diction. So masked in these was the man, that readers did not see, nay, do not see, how scientifically nonsensical was much in the description of that inner world.

Consider this from the *Human Understanding*, ch. II: 'The mind very often sets itself on work in search of some hidden idea, and turns, as it were, the eye of the soul on it.'

<sup>1</sup> All great teachers supplement but do not supplant. *Life of Shri Ramakrishna*, 1929 (p. 175).

The 'as it were' (like the *iva* of the Upanishad above) offers a literary apology, yet even so what a topsy-turvy way to present the 'man' or 'soul' as the tool of the 'mind'! He goes on: 'though sometimes too they start up of their own accord, and offer themselves to the understanding.' Here 'ideas,' like those Pali *dhamma*'s, are presented with a 'will' and with 'selves.' In this elegant vein Locke could have written the *Questions of King Milinda*!

I will not weight this little article with more of such slovenliness in either Locke, or in his heirs, Scottish or English. I quote so much to show how blinded we were as to a clear vision of the experiencer and the experience from the start. When psychology passed into the scientific laboratory, its diction became more austere. My own teacher Croom Robertson and his teacher Bain were fastidiously unsloven in their diction. Yet even they were so far myopic that they did not take the man, the self, as the inexpugnable *poû stô* and avowed limit-point, in their exposition of experience as (a) presented to him, (b) valued by him, (c) reacted upon by him. It was only James Ward who boldly got the ostrich's head out of the sand as to (a). And he failed to convince, perhaps because he was not bold enough about (b) and (c).

But he did fail, being held to have imported metaphysic into science. Else is it hardly credible that psychological manuals of our own day, bearing among them such a proud title as *The New Psychology*, should revive the old foolish methods permissible to the seventeenth century. Look at this sample: 'The rational faculty prompts the mind to refuse implicit obedience.' . . . (But the mind, like Queen Victoria, is 'not amused' and hits back.) 'The complex responsible for the act . . . is not recognized by the mind . . . most minds simply cannot tolerate . . . a recognition; . . . they expend untiring ingenuity in inventing some more respectable reason. . . .' (viz. more respectable *mannikin*). There is plenty more of this sort. The writer may have meant us to take it all as humorously as we do the

queen's biting jest. But he does not seem here to have lapsed from scientific seriousness, nor does he send over to us any *caveat* about mannikins of mental states posturing as the man.

Not for a moment would I hold up to ridicule the work and importance of psychology. More power to her elbow! Her object is the discovery and clear sober presentation of what is true within a certain range. But her power is likely in that object to be more effective if she will but take up a sound attitude from the first, and not one which has led her to start, and here and there to maintain, a way of slovenliness in verbal subterfuge, which is so similar to that on which Buddhists of old fell back, on which they yet fall back to-day.

Were I young, I half think I might come back to *mes premiers amours*, and write, not a New, but a very Old Psychology. I should like to see the self, the man-in-man, in it given, under my (a), (b), (c), a fair chance. I want to see him *tamen usque recurrens*. Psychology has followed physiology with too little vision. She has not sufficiently seen that she is not a wholly parallel study. She is not just the study of mind-ways or mindings; but is the study of 'man as being impressed,' 'man as fitted to receive impressions,' 'man as reacting, valuing impressions.' She is a middle term. Not to see this is 'to expel nature.' In the mind as dummy man, in the personified ideas, &c., the man does come back. But it is in his servants' guise; it is masking as his clothes. Expelled as a More than his mind, he is taken back as a Less than he truly is, in what is a Less than he.

It is in this getting the worse in the exchange that I would, here again, emphasize what I judge to be the harm Buddhism has suffered, is suffering, through this expulsion of the true manhood, this setting up of a makeshift manhood. I now once more stress this aspect of the expulsion, that, whereas in a great world-religion, its first messenger sets before the man a More in his nature, his life, his destiny, not so well

seen before, any succeeding dogma, which ejects the man himself, and replaces the void so left by his instruments, is a telling him that he is, and has, in and before him, a Less.

My friend James B. Pratt has lately said, in the periodical *Visvabharati* that, of two very noble religions asking admission or readmission at India's door, the *An-attā* doctrine in the one is neither of its best nor is it fundamental. I agree, but I go further. I look on it, in its full evolved sense *as recorded*, as a terrible libel on that Gotama whom his church came to call Buddha. Pratt does not think it likely that such a dogma will make appeal to the deeply spiritual people whose greatest books have been and still remain the Upanishads and the *Bhagavadgītā*. To this I could better agree had I firsthand knowledge, as has he, of India. But I would add, that I see here for young India a twofold danger. Because of the modern evasions and compromises as to the true historical meaning of *an-attā*, students may fail to see it for what it truly is. Because of the makeshift dummies posing as the man their vision may be confused. Secondly, they may, in acquiring Western culture, get infected by the equally self-cheating methods in our own psychology.

The true, the original message of Buddhism, when shorn of its monkish superstructures, is both an Indian gospel and a world-gospel, as true now at its centre as it has ever been. India in the Few had been feeling after it; Gotama brought it out to the Many. But it was something a long sight better than *an-attā*—or than *aniccha* or *dukkha* either. It was something different. These belong to man-in-the-Less. That was of a More in and for man. And for it the Man, first and last, was the most real thing about it. However much the pitchfork got to work, the 'left-in's' survive to show us that.

C. A. F. RHYS DAVIDS.

## SPINOZA

WE have recently been celebrating the tercentenary of Benedict Spinoza; and I could wish that the celebrations might induce people to study the life and works of this great and noble-minded man. Many years ago, I was led, more or less by accident, to read him, and I can say without exaggeration that his books made a deeper and more lasting impression on me than any others whatever apart from the New Testament and the Book of Job. I believe they would have the same effect on anybody who would give them the necessary close attention.

At first sight they seem so abstract and refined as to have no bearing on actual life. The chief of them is written in a series of propositions like those of Euclid, with axioms, postulates, and corollaries which seem designed to 'put the reader off'; and the subjects dealt with are infinites, attributes, and modes, with which the ordinary man can have little concern. And yet, Spinoza tells us, it was all with a practical purpose—to help us to live a good life. Hear what he says himself:

'I could see the benefits which are acquired through fame and riches; and I saw that if true happiness chanced to be placed in them I should necessarily miss it by aiming at something else. Now men, to judge by their actions, regard Riches, Fame, and the Pleasures of Sense as the highest good. But when the pleasures of sense are exhausted, they are followed by extreme melancholy, whereby the mind is disturbed and dulled. The pursuit of honours and riches is likewise very absorbing; and in the case of fame the mind is still more deeply absorbed. Nor is the attainment of riches and fame followed, like that of sensual pleasure, by repentance, but the more we acquire the more we are driven to increase both the one and the other. Hence, if I commenced the search for these for the sake of something else,



I feared that I might be giving up a sure good for something uncertain. But, after reflecting, I convinced myself that, if I could get to the root of the matter, I should be renouncing certain *evils* for a certain *good*. For these things, which men pursue, are perishable: whereas what I was seeking was a thing eternal and infinite, the love of which fills the mind wholly with joy, and is itself unmingled with any sadness, wherefore it is greatly to be desired and sought for with all our strength.'

Spinoza goes on to say that he did not attain this joy without an effort. The love of riches, fame, and the pleasures of sense was very strong in him, and could not easily be suppressed: but he found that it was not unconquerable, and could be driven out by a higher affection. Steadfastly setting his eyes on the chief good, he was able gradually to kill the attraction of these lesser and dubious goods: and having himself more or less attained, he wrote his books to help others to attain. His own life, amid poverty, obloquy, and danger, was a model of calm acquiescence; whilst the lives of those who seek the lesser goods are rarely free from discontent, tumult, or even despair. There must be *something* in a system which gives such a solid ground to rest upon.

For many years Spinoza worked indefatigably at perfecting his system—supplying his modest physical wants by grinding optical glasses, and spending his free hours in hard thinking and putting down his thoughts on paper. At length the great work was finished—a work which will not be forgotten while the world lasts. Here are its concluding words:

'I have thus completed all I wished to say touching the mind's freedom and power over the emotions. Whence it is clear how potent is the wise man, and how much he surpasses the ignorant man who is driven only by his lusts. For that man is not only distracted by external causes without ever gaining true content, but lives, not knowing himself or God or things, and ceases not to suffer till he ceases to be. But

the wise man never ceases to be, preserving always true content of spirit.

'If the way I have pointed out seems exceedingly hard, it is yet not unattainable. Needs must it be hard, since so few find it. How, if salvation were to be gained without great labour, could it be missed by almost all men? But all things excellent are as difficult as they are rare.'

Thus Spinoza, like other great teachers, bases his appeal not on the smoothness but on the roughness of the path he bids us follow. He calls on that instinct in men which loves difficulty and is allured by hindrances. For him, as for Christ, strait is the gate, and narrow is the way; and few there be that find it. There is, in fact, a sympathy between him and the founder of Christianity which, in one who never was a Christian and could never have become one, is very remarkable, and is expressed in very remarkable words. 'God,' he says, 'communicated of his essence in greatest perfection to the mind of Christ, who apprehended the saving will of God immediately, mind to mind, in unique spiritual communion. . . . To Christ alone did God give revelations not accommodated to his opinions, but directly: that is to say, Christ really understood the things revealed.' Like Jesus, Spinoza was a Jew who had been put out of the Synagogue. As nearly as circumstances allowed, he penetrated the mind of Jesus; and 'it is not wonderful,' as Martineau says, 'that on that gracious figure, standing so clear of all that had alienated him from Judaism, his eyes should rest with a strange repose.'

It is true that there are some sayings in his works which, at least to the superficial glance, seem impossible to reconcile with the Gospel precepts. I will mention one or two. 'He who loves God cannot endeavour that God should love him in return.' 'Strictly speaking, God does not love or hate any one.' 'Repentance is not a virtue, nor does it arise from reason; but he who repents of an action is doubly wretched or infirm.' I do not, however, think that even this last

saying is quite so startling as it appears. *Mere* repentance I imagine Christ would have censured as strongly as Spinoza: remorse that does not involve a change of heart is often nothing but a luxurious indulgence, and a sad waste of energy. Few things are less admirable than a continued course of alternate sinning and repenting: and the man who sins against you seventy-seven times may provide you with an opportunity of exercising your own charity, but is certainly not an admirable character.

But be this as it may, Spinoza's writings abound in sayings that cannot fail to enlarge and elevate our minds. Particularly, perhaps, do such sayings abound in those passages where he abandons his strict geometric method, and condescends to the ordinary intelligence, or even to an appeal to every-day experience. To take but one example, it is a piece of shrewd insight when he points out that the dejected man—the man, in the jargon of to-day, with an inferiority complex—is very near akin to the proud man. 'For, as his pain arises from a comparison between his own weakness and other men's power or virtue, it will be removed—or in other words he will feel pleasure—if his imagination be occupied in contemplating other men's faults: hence the proverb, The unhappy find comfort when they find others unhappy.' Thus, as Spinoza remarks, the proud man avoids the company of his superiors; for his very vanity makes him writhe under the sense of inferiority.

It must not be imagined that in speaking so highly of Spinoza's works, I imply that I agree with them as a whole. In fact, I do not imagine that among the thousands who have read him he has found a single professed disciple. As Froude remarks, he has the peculiarity that he raises our opinion of his intellectual and moral power to a great height, and yet fails to carry conviction. Partially this may be due to his subject, and partially to the guise in which he presents it. He deals with metaphysical questions, and in the region of metaphysics it is open to any one to assert or deny at pleasure;

to the metaphysician's 'It must be so,' we are constantly driven to answer 'Why?' On the other hand, his methods of argument are sometimes scholastic and medieval; and thus neither his premises nor his ways of reasoning from them are ours. His proof of the existence of God will hardly convince even those who are convinced of it already. 'If his necessary existence be denied, conceive, if possible, that God does not exist. Then his essence does not involve existence. But this (by a previous proposition) is absurd. Therefore God necessarily exists.' None the less, Spinoza's *suggestive* power has influenced almost all subsequent philosophers, and the traces of this influence are to be found in the writings of thinkers who are utterly opposed to his conclusions. As to his influence on men who are not primarily philosophers, the names of Coleridge, Goethe, Shelley, Froude, and Matthew Arnold are a sufficient proof.

The difficulty of the *Ethics* is indeed immense, and he would be a bold man who should say that he fully understood the half of it. But I think that any person of ordinary intelligence can contrive to understand the Third Part, in which human emotions are analysed and defined, with the same calmness, and in the same detached fashion, as if the writer were concerned with lines, planes, and solids. Nor is there any insuperable difficulty in the tractate 'De Intellectus Emendatione,' 'On the Improvement of the Understanding,' with which the student might well begin. There are many good (and some bad) translations, of which Hale White's or Elwes's will do as well as any. Of the countless commentaries and essays, Pollock's, Caird's, and Martineau's will supply the reader with much to think about, and will incidentally shew him how philosophers with the most varying points of view can find inspiration in a philosopher with whom they disagree yet whom they all admire.

E. E. KELLETT.

## WILLIAM COBBETT'S ENGLAND

**A** FEW weeks ago, there appeared in several newspapers and periodicals, a full-page statement 'prepared and paid for' by one of the greatest Captains of Industry the world has ever known, calling upon the multitudes of unemployed men in our cities *to return to the land*.

'The land!' exclaimed this Captain of Industry, 'The land! That is where our roots are. There is the basis of our physical life. The further we get away from the land, the greater our insecurity. From the land comes everything that supports life, everything that we use for the services of physical life. . . .'

I.—This significant message comes, strangely enough, a century or so after the beginning of that great movement *away* from the land, the so-called Industrial Revolution. Even before 1792, the development of machinery in English factories began to draw thousands away from the land; and during the 'great war' (1793–1815), the tremendous demand for iron, and steel, cloth and cotton for military purposes, caused the shifting of considerable numbers of labourers from the farms and fields to the factories. Carried away by the dream of the industrial supremacy of England, employers of labour gave themselves up to a season of wild speculation. They looked forward to years and years of uninterrupted industrial expansion. They even adopted a system of 'protection,' imposing heavy duty on the supply of goods from foreign countries, and proceeded to rake in immense fortunes. There was grave danger in all this—as there is in all 'booms' of a similar kind. But the industrialists set up their factories and continued to draw men away from the countryside. Then came peace. Suddenly the inflated war prices ceased. The foreign markets, glutted with a vastly-increased output of goods, began to return great quantities of English goods. The labour market was affected by the disbanding of thousands of soldiers and sailors. There was



a wholesale dismissal of factory operatives. And the distress that followed spread misery and gloom and discontent throughout the land; but 'the worst of the stress,' says Sir Charles Oman, 'fell on the unfortunate labourers, though they had not shared in the profits of the time of inflated prices that had just ended.'

Among the men who sensed the danger of the domination of agriculture by industry, and who protested against the turning of England into a workshop and factory, was William Cobbett (1763-1837). Living as he did during the latter part of the eighteenth century and the first part of the nineteenth, Cobbett was able, from general experience, to contrast the condition of the agricultural labourer in the period of distress and misery following the industrial experiment and the war, with what he remembered in the comparatively happier period of his boyhood. He believed that the England of his youth had been changed by the invasion of the industrial system, by the inflation of prices, by the new paper money, and the heavy taxation imposed by a Government that did not seem to understand the plight of the agricultural interests.

The conditions that prevailed in England during the early part of the nineteenth century are partially revealed to us in the clear and vigorous writings of this farmer-patriot. In the pages of Cobbett's *Rural Rides*, those of us who are being affected by the tail-end (?) of the blundering industrial regime, may find some interest in the scenes that set off the conditions at the beginning of the system. In fact, the striking similarity and contrast of those days and these enhance our interest in reading *Rural Rides*. Cobbett, says G. K. Chesterton, 'saw all these things in the season of their youth and hope, when all reformers and pioneers believed in them, and when only a few irrational reactionaries resisted them.' The Editor of the *Register* was met everywhere, riding about the country, a guest from time to time at farm-houses and country inns,

' . . . stopping here and there; talking freely with everybody. Hearing what gentlemen, farmers, tradesmen, journeymen, labourers, women, girls, boys, and all have to say; reasoning with some, laughing with others, and observing all that passes . . .'<sup>1</sup>

Cobbett started out on his first tour of inspection in the autumn of 1821. He rode through Hants, Wiltshire, Gloucester and Hereford, returning by way of Oxford. It is with a patriot's pride that he set down his impressions 'as fresh as the dew,' and had them published from week to week in his *Register*. His comments were most interesting—even if his conclusions were not always correct. He took his readers along with him from place to place; he wanted them to realize the state in which he found the countryside.

II.—In *Rural Rides* we have William Cobbett's impressions of English country life in the early part of the nineteenth century. As we travel with him through field and meadow past labourers' cottages and hovels, by lovely orchards and gardens, we are able not only to catch the spirit of the man himself, but also to get some idea of his England and the changes that were taking place. We set out with Cobbett in a fog 'that you might cut with a knife,' and on the road from London to Newbury meet farmers who 'complain most bitterly' about the low prices. 'But they hang on,' says Cobbett, who is a shrewd observer; 'these farmers hang on like sailors to the masts or hulls of a wreck. They know nothing of the cause of their bad times, but they hope the times will mend.' We ride on through beautiful woods near Lord Carnarvon's place at Highclere, where the oaks are still covered, the beeches in their best dress, the elms yet pretty green, and the beautiful ashes only beginning to turn off. 'His Lordship may be a Whig,' observes Cobbett, 'the best in his set, but does he think that his tenants can sell fat hogs at 7s. 6d. a score, and pay him more than a third of the rent that they have paid him?' It seems that

<sup>1</sup> Cobbett's *Rural Rides*, reprinted from the *Register* (1830); December 2, 1822.

this same Lord Carnarvon told a man in 1820 that he did not like William Cobbett's politics.

'But what did he mean by my politics?' says the Tory farmer. 'I have no politics but such as he *ought* to like. I want to do away with that infernal system which, after having beggared and pauperized the labouring classes, has now, according to the report made by the ministers themselves, to the House of Commons, plunged the owners of the land themselves into a state of distress, for which those ministers themselves can find no remedy! To be sure I labour most assiduously to destroy a system of distress and misery . . .'

Shortly we meet a farmer who swears that he was offered so little for some of his wheat that he is resolved not to take any more of it to market, but to give it to hogs. The country through which we are riding now is, to Cobbett's fancy, very nice—continual hill and dell. The soil is very good in quality.

We take to the road early the next morning (November 5). There is a white frost when we start, and the rooks are making the noises they always make in the winter. The starlings are out in large flocks (which is deemed a sign of a hard winter, says Cobbett), and the haws are abundant (another sign of a hard winter ahead). Although the wheat is high, this region is not prosperous-looking. Near Marlborough, Cobbett observes the labourers along the way. They are very poor indeed.

'Farm houses with twenty ricks round each, besides those standing in the fields; pieces of wheat, 50, 60, or 100 acres in a piece; but a group of women labourers . . . presented such an assemblage of rags as I never before saw even among the hoppers at Farnham, many of whom are common beggars. I never before saw *country* people, and reapers too, observe, so miserable in appearance as these. There are some very pretty girls, but ragged as colts and as pale as ashes. The day was cold, too, and frost hardly off the ground; and their blue arms and lips would have made any heart ache but that of a seat-seller or a loan-jobber. . . .'

We take these passages from Cobbett's Journal because in his own clear, perspicuous, thoroughly English style, he

is able to set off a scene to the utmost advantage. His retentive memory and powers of observation may be trusted in scenes like these. His opinions may be the fruit of his emotions but in the reporting of an actual scene, he seizes the facts which make for his view and seldom fails to present the human aspect of the situation in a few vigorous strokes.

We spend the night in a dairy farm-house at Hannington, from which point we resume our ride the next morning. We overtake a farmer going with porkers to Highworth market. The poor man informs us that the porkers weigh four score and a half, and that he hopes to realize 7s. 6d. a score. Cobbett expresses his doubt. We are nearing Cirencester (which the people call Cititer). The country around here is cheerless, but all of a sudden, from the top of the hill, the view changes—the vale of Gloucester lies before us. Says Cobbett:

‘All here is fine; fine farms; fine pastures; all inclosed fields; all divided by hedges; orchards a plenty . . . and, which is of a vast deal more importance, the labourers’ dwellings, as I came along, looked good, and the labourers’ themselves pretty well as to dress and healthiness. The girls at work in the fields (always my standard) are not in rags, with bits of shoes tied to their feet, and rags tied round their ankles, as they had in Wiltshire.’

On quitting Gloucester, we cross the Severn, and travel through apple orchards and sheep pastures; ‘surpassing upon an average,’ says Cobbett, ‘any that I have seen in England.’ We reach Hereford on market-day, and Cobbett avails himself of the opportunity to meet some farmers and talk about conditions. We spend several days in the Bollitree district, and then take the coach to Oxford. On beholding the ‘masses of buildings devoted to what they call *learning*,’ Cobbett says that he can not help ‘reflecting on the drones that they contain and the wasps they send forth!’ Well—the subject of education, like the Unitarians, the Quakers, the Jews, the Dissenters, and the *Edinburgh Reviewers*, is a bug-bear to this yeoman. He sticks to several old prejudices

of his class—prejudices which conflict strangely with his liberal views on reform. But he consistently prides himself on the fact that he is not a college man, and talks with profound scorn of 'the frivolous idiots' that are turned out by the English system of 'heddikashun,' and—we cannot help but smile.

The vale of Berkshire impresses Cobbett with its rich crop of wheat and beans. This part of the trip has been wet, and we have been soaked many times. Cobbett, therefore, is in just the mood to vent his spleen on the awful paper-system, the loan-jobbers, the lottery-dealers, the pensioners, the sinecurists, the borough-mongers, and all others who are doing so much to ruin the agricultural interests of the country.

Before the close of the year (1821), Cobbett makes a second trip, this time through Kent, Suffolk, Norfolk and Sussex. We listen to him as he addresses a group of farmers at Norwich on market-day.

'What a scene is here!' he exclaims; 'a set of men, occupiers of the land; producers of all we eat, drink, wear, and of all that forms the buildings that shelter us; a set of men industrious and careful by habit; cool, thoughtful and sensible from the instructions of nature . . . to see a set of men like this plunged into anxiety, embarrassment, jeopardy, not to be described . . .'

Such a sight, says he, is sufficient to sink any heart. The agricultural state of the country, or rather the quality of the land, from Bromley to Battle, seems hopeless to Cobbett. At Battle, he learns that not less than three hundred landlords and farmers, 'brought from their homes by their distresses and by their alarms for the future,' are meeting to draw up a petition to parliament praying for relief. This action pleases him. For the past twenty years he has been trying to persuade these farmers and landlords that the true remedy for their ills is to be found in parliamentary reform. He insists that at present parliament is in the hands of a small number of persons who, instead of administering the



country for the welfare of the agriculturists, have turned their power to selfish ends. To deprive them of this power he maintains, it would be necessary to reform the House of Commons, so that the members might be elected by the bulk of the people. In this way only could the state be made amenable to the wishes of the governed.

In June (1822) Cobbett rides through Hertfordshire and Buckingham; and in the autumn through Hampshire, Berkshire, Surrey and Essex. The hedges in Hertfordshire are full of the shepherd's rose, honeysuckle, and all sorts of wild flowers. 'Talk of pleasure-grounds,' says he, 'what has man ever invented under the name of pleasure-grounds can equal these fields in Hertfordshire?' Between Hampstead and Chesham the land is not so good, but all along the way, he is pleased to see that the labourers' dwellings are snug and comfortable. We have learned by now that Cobbett's attitude towards politics is not quite the Tory attitude; nor is it an out-and-out Whig attitude. He calls himself a Radical, but his alliance with the radical element is rather superficial. The Radicals believe in the freedom of industry, in the encouragement of manufactures, and in the growth of capital. Cobbett's sentiment on these matters is entirely different. He holds that all real wealth comes from the land, and he denounces the industrial capitalist in very severe language. What, he asks, is Capital? It is, he declares, money taken from the labouring classes and given to army tailors and the like—money that enables these 'new' men to keep fox hounds and trace their descent from Norman barons! All his life, Cobbett has stood forth as a champion of that class to which he belongs. His desire to improve their condition is the sum and substance of his politics. Whatever men and measures are likely to give the agricultural class plenty of wholesome food and beer (instead of the stale crust and tea that they are condemned to live on at this time) he is willing to praise. And whatever men and measures do not directly offer these blessings to his agricultural classes,

he unsparingly denounces from the roof-tops. Here are the labourers' dwellings on the road to Chesham . . . he is satisfied with them, and has a nice word for them:

'And you see here, as in Kent, Sussex, Surrey and Hampshire, and, indeed, in almost every part of England, that most interesting of all objects, that which is such an honour to England, and that which distinguishes it from all the rest of the world, namely, those *neatly kept and productive little gardens round the labourers' houses* which are seldom unornamented with more or less of flowers. We have only to look at those to know what sort of people English labourers are . . .'

One morning in September, we set off in a drizzling rain—Cobbett has his son with him—on the road to Uphusband, near Andover. We avoid the turnpike roads and the inns, because says Cobbett, we are out to see the farmer at home and the labourer in the field. We ride across Putney Bridge into Surrey. Thence over Barnes Common, and, after some time on the upper side of Richmond, we get into Middlesex . . . an *ugly* region, notwithstanding the millions and millions which, according to Cobbett, this county is 'continually sucking up from the rest of the kingdom.' At Chertsey, we are in Surrey again, and visit a fair. No sheep for sale here—everything exceedingly *dull*. Cart colts, two and three years old, are selling for *less than a third* of what they sold for in 1813. The price of cattle is low almost beyond belief. Pigs, we are informed, are dirt cheap. We resume our ride towards Guildford, and for five miles the land is 'a rascally common covered with poor heath.' That night we stop at Chilworth—the narrow and exquisitely beautiful vale, in which the farms are fine, and where they are sowing wheat. The next day, on the road to Wrecclesham, we come upon a parcel of labourers, at parish-work.

'Amongst them was an old playmate of mine,' says Cobbett. 'The account they gave of their situation was very dismal. The harvest was over early. The hop-picking is now over; and now they are employed by the *parish*; that is to say . . . at the expense of half-ruined farmers and tradesmen and landlords, to break stones

into very small pieces to make nice smooth roads lest the jolting, in going along them, should create bile in the stomach of the over-tax-eaters. I call upon mankind to witness this scene. . . .'

On the return trip to London (the great Wen) we pass through the miserable country around Alderbridge, Crookham, Brimton, Mortimer, Strathfield Say, Heckfield Heath, Eversley, Blackwater—and are glad to rest at Oakingham for the night. Cobbett, however, shows no signs of fatigue! He is scribbling something on his tablets, and thinking up some scheme. His industry is marvellous. Nothing can damp his ardour. He is writing a few paragraphs for the *Register* on the farm-houses in this region:

' . . . and it is manifest to every man who has eyes to see with, that the villages are regularly wasting away. This is the case in all parts of the kingdom . . . in all the really agricultural villages . . . there is a shocking decay; a great dilapidation and constant pulling down and falling down of houses. The farm-houses are not so many as they were forty years ago by three-fourths. That is to say, the infernal system of Pitt and his followers has annihilated three parts out of the four of the farmhouses. . . .'

III.—As the distress grows more acute, Cobbett's pen is busier and more vigorous. He has announced in the *Register* his desire to place himself in the midst of all the great fairs of the west, in order, before the winter campaign begins:

'I wish to see many people,' says he, 'and to talk to them; and there are a great many people who wish to see and to talk to me. What better reason can be given for a man's going about the country and dining at fairs and markets?' (Winchester, September 29, 1822.)

Late in 1822, Cobbett addresses his observations on the agricultural distress to Mr. Canning, telling the noble statesman that Mrs. Canning and their children may be dear to him (Canning), but, sir, not more dear than are to them the wives and children of two-hundred thousand men, who, by the acts of the House of Commons, see those wives and children doomed to beggary.

'These firesides, in which I have always so delighted, I now approach with pain. I was, not long ago, sitting round the fire with as worthy and as industrious a man as all England contains. There was his son, about nineteen years of age; two daughters from fifteen to eighteen; and a little boy sitting on his father's knee. I knew, but not from him, that there was a mortgage on his farm. . . . The deep and deeper gloom on a countenance once so cheerful told me what was passing in his breast, when turning away my looks in order to seem not to perceive the effect of my words, I saw the eyes of his wife full of tears. . . .'

Every now and then there is a burst of feeling in Cobbett's writing, and also there is fierce indignation and impulsiveness. To this impulsiveness may be ascribed that unbridled readiness with which he hurls charges in the most violent language against the statesmen who, he believes, are twiddling their thumbs while labourers are sinking in the quagmires of ruin and despair. In a diatribe, showing that 'honest labourers are far worse off than felons,' he shouts:

'Oh! you wish to keep up the price of corn for the good of the poor devils of labourers who have hardly a rag to cover them! Admirable feeling, tender-hearted souls! Did not—oh, oh! did not care even about the farmers. It was only for the sake of the poor naked labourers . . .'

and in his famous 'sermon' on the 'Rights of the Poor,' he talks out in powerful language, so that there is no mistaking his meaning:

'The man who wholly disregards every moral and religious consideration; who tells you at once that he regards the labourers as cattle, and that he has a right to treat them in that way which shall be most conducive to his own advantage, is consistent enough; he is a brute in human shape; like a brute he acts, with the additional malignity of human refinement.

'But what are we to say of the pretended friend of religion; of the circulator of the Bible; of the propagator of the Gospel, who, with brotherly love on his lips, sweats down to a skeleton, and sends nightly home to his starving children, the labourer out of whose bones he extracts even the means of his ostentatious display of piety? What are we to say of the bitter persecutor of "infidels" who, while he says grace over the sumptuous meals, can hear, with the smallest emotion, the hectic coughs of the squalid crowds whose half-famished bodies pine away in the pestiferous air of the prison which he calls a factory!'

This is the rhetoric of a man who feels deeply the injury done his own people. A case of oppression rouses at once two sentiments in William Cobbett's heart: the one, tender and helpful, and of ready sympathy for the sufferer; the other, an irresistible desire to kick the rascal who causes the suffering. And kick he will—with all the strength and energy of his nature.

There is a story told about Cobbett that may fit here. It seems that when his wife lay ill, and could not sleep on account of the noise the dogs were making around the house, William Cobbett sallied forth barefooted (that he might not disturb the patient) and, walking backwards and forwards threw stones to keep the dogs at a distance. During the years of his editorship of the *Register* (1802–1835), we see William Cobbett trying to perform a similar service, but on a bigger scale, for England. He is a self-appointed protector of the health and happiness of the countryside. As he goes about the country, backwards and forwards, he flings denunciations at the borough-mongers, stock-jobbers, loan-sharks, the ministers ('hell-fire miscreants'), Malthus ('Check-population parson'), Ricardo ('The Oracle'), Peel ('the Oxford Scholar'), Canning ('The Jester'), Lord Liverpool ('the Stern-path-of-Duty-man'); and at the National Debt, the standing army, pensions, tea-swivelling, potatoes, &c.—all enemies of the fair England he loves so ardently.

In one of his transports of patriotic joy and pride (*Political Register*, July 30, 1803) at the beginning of his career as the 'concentrated essence of the national spirit,' Cobbett strikes a note which declared his natural love of England's fair fields and gardens:

'The sun,' declares he, 'in the whole course round the globe, shines not on a spot so blessed as this great, and now united kingdom; gay and productive fields and gardens, lofty and extensive woods, innumerable flocks and herds, rich and inexhaustible mines, a mild and wholesome climate, giving health, activity, and vigour to fourteen millions of people . . .'

This strong love of downs and woods and orchards and fields—and of the men and women who cultivate the soil—



fills his long life (he is seventy-three years old when he makes his last speech on Agricultural Distress, a few weeks before his death) with courage, sympathy and excellent spirits. During the five happy years (1804-1809) of his life as a jolly yeoman host at Botley, we see him gathering his family and friends and neighbours for country games and riding and fishing. He is delighted with his shade trees, his flower-gardens, his orchards, and the beautiful scenes of the countryside. When he loses his farm and home at Botley, he moves to Kensington, where he courageously starts all over again to cultivate another plot of land, and to retrieve his fortunes by writing the books *Cottage Economy* (1821); *The Woodlands* (1825); *The English Gardener* (1827); *Advice to Young Men* (1830); and *Rural Rides* for the *Register* (1821-1830)—books that show that to the end he retained a fresh interest in and intimate knowledge of English country life. In the first general election after the passing of the Reform Bill, Cobbett was triumphantly returned as a member of Parliament for Oldham, and took his seat (January 23, 1835), simultaneously with the overthrow of his enemies, the borough-mongers.

Nearly a century has passed since Cobbett championed the cause of agriculture and the land. And, it would surely make his old ghost smile (if ghosts ever feel like smiling) to find in the statement from the great Captain of Industry, already referred to at the head of this article, the heart of his own message. Says the Industrial Capitalist (1932):

'We are saying to the people, "Here is the Land. How much can you use?" . . . Let every man and every family at this season of the year cultivate a plot of land and raise a sufficient supply for themselves and others . . . *Industrial* concerns everywhere would gladly make it possible for their men, employed and *unemployed*, to find and work the land. . . .'

Cobbett's England has changed considerably during the past hundred years of economic and industrial advancement. Many of the changes have produced material benefits and comforts for a multitude of people. Also, not a few immense fortunes for a score or two of industrial capitalists. Cobbett

would not have objected to any of these circumstances. His chief concern, however, is the plight of the labourer strong and willing to work—who can not find work at any price, and whose degradation is the work of those who take him away from his plot of land, waste his powers, and try to send him back to the plough. It seems very ironical to read that 'industrial concerns everywhere would gladly make it possible for their men—employed, and, mark you, *unemployed*—to find and work the *land*.' Mr. Chesterton has made the brilliant suggestion that if we did set up a monument to William Cobbett—and surely he deserves one—the pedestal of the monument should have the irritating maxim, 'I told You so!'

MONTAGU FRANK MODDER.

MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

---

*Critical Reviews.* By Benjamin B. Warfield (Oxford University Press. 20s.)

This spacious volume gathers together forty-seven of Dr. Warfield's outstanding criticisms of books on the text of the New Testament, The Natural History of the Christian Religion, Our Bible and the Ancient Monuments, Christian Life in the Primitive Church, The Doctrine of the Atonement, The Person of Jesus Christ, Mysticism, Darwinism and other subjects. All are handled with critical acumen and form real discussions of vital Christian doctrine. Twenty-two pages are given to Evelyn Underhill's work. 'Her *Mysticism* is brilliantly written. All the resources of a trained literary art are expended upon it, and its pages are not only illuminated with numerous well-chosen extracts from the Mystical writers who are thus permitted to tell in their own quaint and often singularly impressive language exactly what they are, but are also gemmed with vivid phrases caught from the Mystics and used by Miss Underhill in her own composition with exquisite skill.' This is true reviewing which is not only illuminating but appreciate and really pleasant to read.

## THE CROSS IN SOUTH AFRICA

**T**HE Cross in Africa! That is the hope of the dark Continent: for it is still true in these days of civilization's far-reaching influence in Africa that, where that for which the Cross stands is unknown, there is darkness, stagnation and what Livingstone called 'the unspeakable depths of pain and sin.'

It is a common-place in the Western Church to speak of the Cross as central to any scheme of human redemption, and in its application it reveals God. 'Christ chose the Cross, and in choosing it revealed God,' so says Dr. Glover in *The Jesus of History*. The essential feature in it all for our purpose here is that the Cross did indeed reveal the love of God in sacrifice. That is the wonder which has held men's minds in reverence and amazement—that God was after them with a heart of love and compassion. God so loved the world that He gave His only son to die on the Cross. No wonder that the native woman when she heard her first message from that word said, 'There must be a God like that!' She was voicing Africa's deepest and innermost intuition. But what an amazing thought—God was after a lost continent!

There is hope now for *the children of Uluntu* for whom the Son of God shed His blood.

This is not the place for a disquisition on the doctrine of the Cross, but *the children of Uluntu* understand, have understood from the misty ages of their long *past*, that somehow sacrifice holds the secret of relief, propitiation and peace. And for all the native races of Africa the Christian teaching has been, and is to-day, particularly definite.

The Cross unveils the solemn fact of sin; it reveals the redemptive power of God's love; it bespeaks strength for the new life the African is to live; and it creates a ministry of

confidence, relief and hope. And in South Africa for the last one hundred and thirty years the Cross has been the symbol of the most sacred and noble things in life.

That the Cross is *the symbol of power* has again been abundantly demonstrated in Africa: and Africa is learning that love is the only omnipotence. What is true of India, in its measure is true of Africa: the Eastern symbol of life is a Serpent with its tail in its mouth—a vicious circle. The Cross breaks that horrid evil ring and teaches Africa, as it does the Orient, that life is not a vicious circle—getting nowhere, achieving nothing, but it bespeaks a recreative spiritual energy so sorely needed in the dark Continent.

Hence, with Dean Inge, we do not believe that 'religion, science, ethics and aesthetics, have all become differentiated out of the confused muddle in which they existed together in the mind of the savage.' The knowledge of African anthropology is a useful requisition for the missionary, but knowledge of the doctrine of the Cross is the prime equipment for those who would lift the African out of the swamps of moral, mental and physical evil. The moral pivot of the world is the personality of Jesus Christ who died on the Cross; round that is moving the best in African life; and this is the only sufficient Gospel for Africa. It brings near a God who gives, loves, suffers and dies that it might redeem. The gods of Africa never love, never give, never suffer for their people. Readers of Arthur Southon's *Whispering Bush* will note his fine statement of this fact. In Christ the African beholds a personal loving God—the wonder of it all holds him captive still.

There is a fascination about the story of the planting of the first Cross south of the Equator. It was in the reign of John the Second, King of Portugal, that the Portuguese navigators Diogo Cao and Affonso d'Aveiro, set out under Imperial orders to go south of the Gold Coast. In 1485 Cao (Canus) erected the *podrao* (a Portuguese Cross) on Cape

*Cross (Cape Negro).* It bore two inscriptions and the main one translated from Portuguese to English reads:

'6,684 years had elapsed since the world was created, 148[5]'. . .  
'since the birth of Christ, when the most excellent and most serene King,  
D. Joao the Second of Portugal, ordered this column to be set up by  
Jacobus Conus, Knight.'<sup>1</sup>

Cao (Canus) was the first navigator to carry these crosses and pillars for such use. The ex-Emperor of Germany had this padrao removed to Germany. A replica was erected in its place. A facsimile of the original pillar and cross can be seen in the museum of the Cape of Good Hope.

In 1487 King John sent out a further expedition under the command of Bartholomew Diaz. He was the first to round the Cape of Good Hope and planted five such pillars and crosses on prominent headlands. Landing at Angra Pequena (Luderitzbucht) on November 13, 1487, he erected one and called it Padrao Santiago. Between 1487 and 1833 it was 'cast down by the hands of sailors'—so speaks the historian. The cross itself has never been recovered; but the biggest fragment of the pillar is now in the Cape Museum; two others were sent to Lisbon and one taken to New Zealand, it is said, by the late Sir George Grey. But on the exact spot of Serra Parda (Diaz Point), on the massive grey block of rocks, to the south of the bay there stands a simple cross, and as the writer stood looking at this upstanding cross, when he visited Luderitzbucht, he thought kindly of that '*first Christian to set foot on the soil of Africa south of the Tropic*' of Capricorn.

Bartholomew Diaz erected five such padraoes—Angra Pequena (Padrao Santiago) 1487: Mossel Bay (name of Cross unknown) 1488: Algoa Bay (Padrao da Crioze) 1488: Algoa Bay (Padrao Son Gregorio, on Cape Padron) 1488: Cape of Good Hope, Cabo Tormentoso (Padrao Son Felipe) 1488.

Even in those early days South Africa was prospected and pegged out for Christ. The Cross was planted on its

<sup>1</sup>By courtesy of the Director of the Cape of Good Hope Museum.



headlands and a sub-continent was claimed for Him! How far the claim of that intrepid Portuguese navigator has been made good we can only understand as we peruse the history of Christian missions in the sub-continent. Certainly the period between 1488 to 1790 yields very little to justify the claim. The Portuguese adventurers, sea-faring and spiritual, evidently went eastward and yet the sea-board of Africa from Lourenzo Marque to Mombasa contains little but a few relics of those 'years between' of Christian penetration.

But 1790 to 1820 forms a period of intensive effort to make good the claim of the Crosses set up on the headlands of the Cape of Good Hope. Into the history of South Africa for those years are woven many golden strands of Christian missionary romance. In fact the History itself would be drab and dull without them, and historians like Sir G. E. Cory, Litt D., are not slow to recognize the distinctive part played by the missionaries of the Cross in the upbuilding of modern South Africa.

. . . . .

No account of the Cross in South Africa would be complete if it failed to take cognizance of the sharp conflict Africa has witnessed between the Cross and the Crescent. Hine, in his book, *Days Gone By*, puts the matter in striking contrast: 'A Mahomedan Africa might well be in time a great peril to the world. A Christian Africa may do much for the progress of mankind.'

Islam is still the enemy of Christianity, and, if we mistake not, the supreme alternative for Africa is the Cross or the Crescent: and the Crescent is passionately, bitterly aggressive—in the North from Cairo, in the East from Nairobi, in the South from Capetown.

Historically, as is well known to the student of Missions, Islam knows three great periods in Africa: 'The first, 638-1050 when she over-ran the Mediterranean littoral, Egypt to

Morocco; the second, 1050-1750, when she established herself in Morocco and dominated the Sahara and Western Sudan; the third, 1750-1900, when she established the Wahabis, Nahdi and Dervish orders.'

During the last thirty years Islam has steadily directed her energies towards the dominance of East Africa. In the *L.Q.R.*, October, 1930, we ventured to quote Dr. Zwemwer's figures for the followers of Islam in Africa—49,000,000. South of the great Lakes, Victoria Nyanza and Tanganyika, there are some 283,000 Mahommedans. Of these only about 70,000 are in the Union of South Africa, the bulk of whom are Asiatics. Very few, so far, of the Bantu of South Africa have become followers of Islam. But the menace is there, and friends of Africa who are keen on building what R. L. Stevenson calls the 'Road of the Loving Heart' in the Continent, are anxious to prevent the missionaries of the Crescent from flooding the Union with their teaching.

There are two salients particularly from which they are projecting their thrust. One is Capetown, where a literary campaign is quietly being pursued with papers printed in Arabic and one of the Bantu languages; and the other is in East Africa, where, without doubt, the vital issue is being joined between the Apostles of the Cross and the prophets of the Crescent. At Nairobi the biggest religious building is the Islamic mosque, which cost £70,000 to build. It was in Nairobi and Mombasa that the writer saw even small Indian shoe-makers, mending boots and giving away Mahommedan literature, printed in Arabic and Swahili. From Mombasa to Kisumic and round the great Victoria lake I saw the Voortrekker of the Cross meeting the emissaries of the Crescent. What is needed, and that in this generation, is to build more effectively a barrier of Christian life and service against the encroachments of an on-coming Islam and thus help to keep South Africa as a mighty zone for Christian missionary enterprise.

Students of missions have long been familiar with the fact that a new gospel is being written—the gospel according to India. The followers of *The Christ of the Indian Road* remember that Indian thought and life are slowly being baptized into His spirit, just as were Greek thought and Roman loyalties.

Equally do we believe that the final commentary on the Gospels will not be written until Africa has been really Christianized. And Christ is taking hold of South Africa more encouragingly than many imagine. It has already been stated that there are some 7,000,000 Christians in Africa. Of these over 2,000,000 are Bantu in the Union of South Africa; and we have to consider the deeper implications of these figures.

Christ is taking possession of Bantu thought, life and ambitions. He is teaching them to stand on their own feet, look out on the world with their own eyes, and relate what is with what should be, if the ethics of Christ were dominating the dominant white race in the land.

We realize that the silent Christian spirit is pressing on South African life and changing it—hence all the unrest and trouble of to-day. It is the unrest of progress.

We believe that the Bantu has a contribution to make to the interpretation of Christ to the world. One would give much to look at Christ and the Cross, at life and its problems, through the eyes of the black thinker. The Bantu has gifts well worth encouragement, and these should, as they may be, sublimated by the touch of the Christ spirit.

What are they? A patience even in the most trying environment: a happy optimism: a saving sense of humour: a readiness to forgive and forget: a real love of offspring: an unquenchable faith in the reality and supremacy of the spiritual world, albeit its crudity of expression.

These are elements of Bantu human wealth that are being laid at the feet of Christ; and He is saying to Africa, 'I came not to destroy but to fulfil.' The Bantu is capable of taking

into his thought system, into his social life, into his racial contacts that for which Christ stands. Even the Namaquas could appreciate and appropriate 'His being wounded for our transgressions,' as the following will show.

In the dark ages before the heralds of the Cross brought the light of God to South Africa, the heathen were groping after Him. The Namaquas, as they roamed over the plains and through the mountainous regions of the South-West, made their prayers to one whom they called *Tsui-Xgoab*, just as the Bantu prayed to *Nkulunkulu*—the Great, Great One. In times of great peril, so the story goes, he would lead them unscathed to places of safety, though he himself was wounded and his blood ran to the ground. In their thankfulness they gave to their deliverer the name *Tsui-Xgoab*—the Wounded Knee. And when at last they passed into 'the beyond' they prayed to and put their trust in him. He became their god.

When the Namaquas heard the message of Christ crucified—that He was wounded for them, even unto death, their hearts cried out, 'This is the true *Tsui-Xgoab*. This is the Wounded One, who shed his blood for us. He bled to save us. Jesus is the true *Tsui-Xgoab*.' Christ meets the Namaquas on the level of their capacities of appreciation and appropriation.

The natives of South Africa have powers of observation, generalization and synthesis greater than the West has given them credit for. They are essentially a mystic people, and the essence of Christianity can be assimilated into their soul-life as in our own.

Hence there should be less talk of a differentiated mentality from the European. It is indeed questionable whether they should be allowed to 'develop on their own lines.' I wonder how many really comprehend the meaning of this term when they use it? As we understand the phrase, it means not merely a different civilization from ours, but a *lower* and that is what must be avoided. We would rather see them blunder in the attempt to attain our civilization.

Let it be remembered that for the African 'Christianity is the light that shines amid the darkness of his fears' (Schweitzer). It is the light shining from heaven on the Cross and reflected on his way that makes life worthy, fearless and content. Said one of our most progressive Bantu Christians—Professor Jabavu, of Fort Hare Native College—the greatest gift of Christ to the Bantu is the *gift of comfort*—rest from the fears of heathen superstition and death. Religion, indeed, means deliverance from the bondage of sin, fear and cruelty. But it is a gospel which has at its centre a heart of love—broken. That is the meaning of the Cross on Calvary well understood by the early intrepid missionaries of the Cross.

We remember making our pilgrimage to the Iona of the Methodist Mission in South-East Africa. We trod the soil of Wesleyville, stood on the site of the first Christian Church erected there. (The mission was later moved to a more useful spot.) We looked on the site of the old mission house and caught a glimpse of the once Royal Kraal of William Kama; and as we stood on that commanding position, overlooking the region where once existed a great location of Bantu people, we recalled the words of William Shaw, that first apostle of the Cross at Wesleyville: 'Here the standard of the Cross was first raised, the first Gospel lessons were imparted, the first soul drawn to the Christ and the first triumphs of the Cross achieved; here the first Kafir converts were received into the Holy Catholic Church.'

That standard of the Cross still dominates our vision and inspires our loyalty to our Lord. It is ours still to be Christ-bearers to the Bantu race. We have our controlling vision of Christ and the Bantu walking in happy fellowship down the centuries, and if the Indian can be trusted with Christ, it is our firm conviction, so can the Bantu of South Africa. But there is the solemn truth—the only way of redemption for the African is the way of the Cross.

ALLEN LEA.



# Notes and Discussions

## THE FORMATION OF THE GOSPEL TRADITION

It is the purpose of the following note to call attention to two recent works which are of quite unusual significance for readers of the Gospels. The first is the second edition (1931) of *Die Geschichte der Synoptischen Tradition*, by Rudolf Bultmann, Professor in Marburg. The second work, just published, is the only one, so far as I know, which deals systematically with Bultmann's views. It is Dr. Vincent Taylor's *The Formation of the Gospel Tradition* (Macmillan, 7s. 6d.).

How do we know that our Gospels are reliable? This vital question is becoming articulate inside the Christian Church and in most unlikely places, now that it is no longer possible for most people to answer it by a theory of a special inspiration, guaranteeing the historical accuracy of every sentence in the Bible. The scholarship of a hundred years has answered it partly by means of literary criticism of the sources. The Two-Document theory (Mark and Q) is firmly extended, while some scholars, notably Professor Streeter and Dr. Vincent Taylor himself go further and offer a theory of Four Documents. But the historical vindication cannot reach its goal unless it tells us what happened to the tradition between the years A.D. 30 and (about) 65, when the writing of the Gospels probably began. The problem has been approached along fresh lines by several scholars who together are now described as the school of Form-History. Of these the most radical is Bultmann, whose work first appeared in 1921. He sets himself to investigate the history of the separate oral units of stories and sayings which were in circulation in the Christian community before they were put together in the written Gospels. He thinks that few of them can be preserved in a pure form because the polemical or theological interest of the community must have contaminated them. In a most vigorous and challenging book on *Jesus* (1925), his thesis is that we can know what Jesus *willed*, and about His life, nothing much more. It has been thought that perhaps Bultmann was retracting some of his previous views, because in his *Jesus* he used sayings which he had suspected in his previous work. The importance of the second edition is that Bultmann restates his position uncompromisingly, with much additional illustrative matter. It is brilliant scepticism, and seems to a critic like Dr. Montefiore to foreshadow the results on which critics of the future will be agreed. As Dr. Easton has said, 'in this book Bultmann appears as the most radical serious critic since the days of Strauss.'

Dr. Vincent Taylor's book is an outstanding contribution to the modern study of the historicity of the Gospel tradition. His wide scholarship and balanced judgement are evident on every page. He sees the issues involved; he appropriates from the new school certain

valuable results; but above all he exposes the fallacies involved in Bultmann's excessive scepticism. 'No tendency which conceivably might have corrupted the tradition is missed; no power of the mind to forget, to transform, and to create is neglected. For Bultmann, the personality of Jesus is faint and remote; but the community is alert, full-blooded, ready for every enterprise of corruption and creation' (pp. 106-7). This verdict is just. Dr. Taylor shows that we must allow for the existence of eye-witnesses whose presence could control the tradition; that communities do not create matchless sayings like those of Jesus; that the first Christians were well aware of the distinction between their own utterances and the sayings of their Lord; that the tests of genuineness propounded by Bultmann are much too subjective, and that when we apply (as we can) an objective test, the substantial trustworthiness of the sayings-tradition is demonstrated. In one telling sentence Dr. Taylor summarizes his criticism of Bultmann's book: 'The real charge against him is that he is kinder to the possibilities than to the probabilities of things.'

The Gospel tradition is treated under five main divisions: The Passion-Narratives, the Pronouncement-Stories, the Sayings and Parables, the Miracle-Stories, and the Stories about Jesus. The second of these offers a title which is Dr. Taylor's own coinage. It is applied to the units in the Gospels which give some narrative leading up to a word of Jesus as the climax. 'Pronouncement-Story' is an improvement on the 'Paradym' or 'Apothegm' of the German scholars, and is more exact than the general description 'dialogue.' Everything in such stories turns on the word of Jesus. Are these stories genuine? Bultmann thinks that most of them are 'ideal scenes,' and that the imagination of the community has evolved them. Dr. Taylor points out that there are twenty of these Pronouncement-Stories in Mark, a few in Luke's special material, one in Matthew, none in John. Why do they not increase in number as time passes, and as new problems confront the growing Church? Why, for example, is there no Pronouncement-Story about the necessity of the Gentile Mission? These criticisms, so deadly and so direct, are but samples of the balanced apologetic which Dr. Taylor provides.

One of the main merits of the book is the re-statement of the Proto-Luke hypothesis in the light of the Form-historical studies. In a special appendix a reply is made to the criticisms of Professor J. M. Creed. Another appendix gives the result of some interesting experiments made in the telling and re-telling of a story, in order to discover the tendencies of oral transmission. Additions were made as the story was re-told. But as a rule there was a tendency to abbreviate rather than to expand. In most cases the additions did not distort the narrative. Sometimes they actually served to bring the situation more vividly before the mind. So it was, I believe, in the stories told by Tolstoy to his peasant audience, and told back to him by his hearers after some time had passed.

There is one assumption made by the Form-History school which needs a further examination. It is constantly stated that the form

in which we possess the words and deeds of Jesus was shaped and re-shaped by the recital of them in the first assemblies of the early Christians. This may be true of the Passion-Narratives, which read like a continuous whole, or of many sayings of Jesus. The speeches in the Acts afford some support for this conclusion. But is it at all certain that the Christians of those early years were really interested in the rest of the material which we have in our Gospels?

Dr. Campbell Moody has shown that the Chinese converts, like the Gentile converts in the second century, are not particularly interested in the life of the historical Jesus. How much did Theophilus know, before Luke sent his Gospel to him? It is quite possible that most converts knew little more than some stories of the Passion and Resurrection, and a few bare statements such as are afterwards summarized in the Apostles' Creed. The Gospels may be the result of the extra-ordinary insight of a few individuals, who have been in touch with eye-witnesses, or with those who derived their knowledge from eye-witnesses. Luke, after all, makes this claim. Gerhard Kittel, one of the few New Testament scholars who is thoroughly at home in the Rabbinic literature, points out (*Spätjudentum*, 63) that the Pauline formula ('I received from the Lord what I also delivered unto you,' 1 Cor. xi. 23) and the Papias-tradition about Mark's Gospel (Mark reports in the name of Peter that Jesus taught this and that) are both precisely in the Rabbinic style. This was the recognized way of passing on the tradition of a great teacher. In that case the community would have had much less to do with the shaping of the material than the new school claims.

We can confidently recommend all students of the New Testament to read Dr. Taylor's invaluable book. It is worthy to rank among the best productions of modern British scholarship.

R. NEWTON FLEW.

### LIGHTFOOT OF DURHAM<sup>1</sup>

This volume owes its origin to a conviction that Lightfoot is among the nineteenth-century personalities due for revaluation. And it must be admitted that this 'mosaic of memories,' most skilfully arranged, forms an impressive portrait of one of the greatest scholars of the Anglican Church—a lovable and commanding personality and an eminent Bishop, whose episcopate has been described as 'The Golden Age' of Durham.

It was said at Cambridge that a surer mind never worked yet his influence upon his students as Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College was exercised mainly through what he was. 'If he goes to Durham,' said Dean Church, 'Bishop Butler will have a successor worthy of him in the combination of innocence, simplicity and pure nobleness of

<sup>1</sup> *Lightfoot of Durham: Memories and Appreciations* collected and edited by George R. Eden and F. C. Macdonald. Cambridge University Press. 7s. 6d. net.

thought and purpose with intellectual forces which make his fellows wonder and admire.'

This prophecy was abundantly fulfilled. Dr Lightfoot interpreted the opportunity as the call of God and could not therefore resist it. His decision, perhaps the most momentous in his career, lights up his character: 'My consolation and my hope for the future is that it has cost me the greatest moral effort, the greatest venture of faith I have ever made.'

To Lightfoot, the idea of a Church involved the conception of a corporate life and under his guidance and inspiration vast extension schemes, including new Parishes, new Churches, Mission Districts, seemed to 'grow up like magic.'

His first year at Durham signalized the formation of the Auckland Brotherhood: Three young men, one from Keble College, Oxford, and two from Pembroke College, Cambridge, were the first of a succession to be trained for Holy Orders under the Bishop's own eye. They were received in Auckland Castle not merely as pupils but as 'Sons of the House.' They shared their meals and Chapel services with Bishop Lightfoot and, after their morning studies and lectures, were told off to assist local curates in their parochial work. Their personal recollections are among the most revealing: One recalls as the most striking impression that 'Auckland was Lightfoot, and Lightfoot Auckland. For me he permeated and dominated the whole thing. Lightfoot had no beauty of face or form, but he had a most gorgeous smile, and when this came, it lit up his face and made it fine. I used to save up my funny stories to tell in order to conjure up that smile. It transformed the man.' He also refers to an accepted, though unwritten law of the Brotherhood: 'You go where you are sent, you work till you drop, the Bishop will show you no sort of preference or notice, but . . . you have your place in the Bishop's prayers.'

Visitors, too, were deeply impressed by the atmosphere of Auckland Castle: Robert Barbour, a brilliant Free Church Minister of Scotland, sensitive to its historic appeal, thinks of Bishop Butler's honest bravery in theology—'of a great man doing battle by himself in a quiet corner, until the Church at length awoke and found he had won her victory.' He considers that Butler's seat is filled by his nearest successor, and is charmed by Lightfoot's relationship to the Brotherhood: 'He calls these lads his family, is accessible to all their difficulties and their doubts; but a thing more remarkable, he is open to all their kittenhood of mirth and fun. Within, you have a home and a beehive all in one; without, everything is plain, simple, strenuous.' He feels it good to be in the midst of so much informal earnestness and Christian manliness.

Lightfoot had humour and could be irresistibly droll: One of the great days of the year was St. Peter's Day—the day of the annual gathering of his 'sons' at Auckland Castle. Two of the brethren had grown their beards. They met in the Bishop's presence, somewhat embarrassed. But the Bishop was equal to the occasion. He introduced them to one another, to the delight of the company. These

human touches enable us to see the real man and to appreciate the considered verdict of Bishop Westcott: 'that Lightfoot's greatest work was the Brotherhood of the Clergy whom he called to labour with him in his Diocese—greater than his masterpieces of interpretation, greater than his masterpieces of masculine and yet passionate eloquence.'

A notable undertaking was the division of the Diocese; and, in 1882, Lightfoot took part in the consecration, in Durham Cathedral, of Dr. Ernest Roland Wilberforce, as the first Bishop of Newcastle. His zeal in reorganizing 'The Bishoprick' brought him into touch with the Laity, to whom he gave a more effective voice in the councils of the Church and thus became one of the pioneers of the Church Assembly. He called into being a trained body of Lay Readers and Lay Preachers. A reference to these elicited an interesting tribute to Wesley: 'But your evangelist, it may be said, bears a strong likeness to the Wesleyan local preacher. I am not ashamed of the resemblance, I freely confess my admiration of the marvellous capacity of organization which distinguished John Wesley, and which he has bequeathed to his followers.' It is a tribute to Lightfoot that even the humblest were able to approach him without constraint. On his first visit to Monkwearmouth church a small house was pointed out, which a very self-willed squire had built overlooking the church. The Bishop turned to the verger and said: 'I wonder you allowed Sir Hedworth Williamson to build that house so near.' The man, a typical verger, instantly replied: 'Sir 'Edworth would ha' built 'is 'ouse on your 'ead, my Lord, if e'd 'ad a mind.'

Many interesting reminiscences illustrate the ideal relationship between the Bishop and his Clergy. One of his examining chaplains records that Lightfoot regarded clergy and candidates, all alike, as his 'sons.' Though he steadily raised the intellectual standard he formed his own estimate of a candidate's spiritual capacity and fitness, independent of examination results. 'You did quite right in declining to pass him,' he once said; 'but I know the man and I shall ordain him nevertheless.'

Lightfoot was a tireless worker and set a rare example of industry. In addition to problems involved in the division of the Diocese of Durham and the reorganization of the 'Bishoprick,' he was faced with a preliminary obligation involved in his work as a Reviser of the New Testament. Until these were accomplished his habit was to rise very early, light his own fire and make sure of 'two or three hours' quiet work in his bedroom before breakfast.' The writer of the anonymous appreciation of Lightfoot in the *Quarterly Review*, stresses the conflict between the 'manifold responsibilities of the See of Durham' and his literary commitments. For weeks together he could not find time to write a single line. Yet his monumental work on the *Ignatian Epistles* was published in the autumn of 1885.

The Bishop of Gloucester, who contributes a chapter on 'Lightfoot's Place as a Historian,' claims that the publication of Lightfoot's *Ignatius* represented a quite definite epoch—'the definite assertion of



the scientific method of study over the speculative for early Church History.' This brilliant scholar also claims that Lightfoot's editions of the *Apostolic Fathers* are the most scientific works that have been published on Church History.

Bishop Eden's sermon on Lightfoot, preached before the University of Cambridge, enriches the book. It contains, among other excellent things, a signal illustration of Lightfoot's chivalry. Dr. Westcott, Lightfoot's dearest friend, had been charged with 'intentional deceit' by the anonymous author of *Supernatural Religion*. Lightfoot instantly set himself to refute the charge, and wrote 'surely the most remarkable series of articles ever printed in the *Contemporary Review*.' He not only vindicated his friend but demolished the foundation of a book which had challenged the trustworthiness of the second-century Fathers.

Lightfoot's strength of will is evident in all his achievements. Bishop Harmer records that frequently he would continue writing until the pen faltered in his hand and he fell asleep at his desk. But a few days before his death he was found writing as usual, and returned to his desk immediately the doctor left his room. He seemed to possess the spirit of the Venerable Bede.

We have ourselves heard, within the precincts of Auckland Castle, eloquent discussions on the Lightfoot tradition. And yet it is not only cherished memories of Bishop Moule's affectionate homage this charming book recalls. We remember too, the occasional surprise to find, on the modest shelves of Methodist local preachers in the county of Durham volumes of Lightfoot's Epistles of St. Paul.

This book deserves a wide constituency. In *Lightfoot of Durham* the reader will see, in clear perspective, the character of one who was a scholar, a saint, a Bishop; and above all, a man who never lost the common touch.

B. AQUILA BARBER.

## GOD AS FATHER

The revolt of youth, following on the revolt of woman, bears witness to the passing of the patriarchal social order which ushered in our civilization. In a crowded London 'bus a woman declines the seat offered her by an elderly Clergyman with the remark, loud enough to be heard by all, that life has 'too much of the Heavenly Father about it.'

Not only in those circles where the current 'psychology' is in vogue does the *father* figure as the chief villain in the piece. At a children's entertainment a ventriloquist's puppet informs the audience that 'the Devil' is 'father.' These crude symptoms of our time have their intellectual expression.

Freud of Vienna, a Jew within the Aryan Culture, found a ready hearing when he taught that civilization is repression, and set on foot a myth to account for its origin as crude as any to be found in the

ethnic religions. According to him, the founder of civilization was a violent jealous father, who drove away his sons. One day the brothers combined, slew their father, and ate him to assimilate his strength, by the magic principle. But now he was dead, the 'old man' was even more terrible; they feared to transgress his commands even more than when he was alive, and he reigned in conscience ever more.

That Freud seriously intended this as an account not only of the origin of civilization, but of religion and its sacraments, of conscience and the sense of sin, will be doubted, and yet he repeated it in his book, *Civilization and its Discontents*, as lately as 1930.

Psycho-analysis itself is truly analysed as a phase of Hebrew thought which repudiates the law of Moses and the conception of God that it gave to the world. This is the school of thought which in our time seeks to destroy religion once for all by teaching that God is the 'projection' of the image of the human father upon the universe.

We note the very masculine conception of God which characterized the pastoral Semites, and we can understand that religious conceptions derived from the Jews were readily assimilated by Aryan peoples, pastoral as many of them were in origin, and in their later history living under the *patria potestas* buttressed by Roman law. On the other hand, throughout the Mediterranean countries are the descendants of the agricultural peoples, whose first allegiance through long ages was so completely yielded to the Earth Mother that, notwithstanding Roman Law, and perhaps in refuge from it, their aspiration seeks the feminine in the Deity, whose fulfilment they find in the Mother of Jesus.

Now the fact that for many peoples the fundamental thought of Deity is couched in feminine terms is fatal to the Freudian theory which finds the origin of the idea of God in the unconsciously reflected image of the primitive father. We may accept it as probably historical that the people among whom 'Mother right' prevailed through long ages thought of God as Mother, and that the people who were dominated by Father right thought of God as Father; but whether God is thought of as Father or Mother is entirely secondary to the conception of Deity itself. Maternity, no less than paternity, is creative, and it is the creative fact and idea that finds its most self-evident symbol in fatherhood and motherhood.

Mankind had not to wait until the scientific era for a proper appreciation of the mystery of existence. Every mother who 'conceives' and bears a child, and every father who 'begets,' has approached the central mystery in a more truly experimental manner than analytic thought can do.

It is the simple idea of *birth* that underlies all our thinking about origin or genesis. Nature is simply the womb whence Man has emerged; but the love which begat him, and the mind which tends him, Man can only hope to know in his maturity.

No *educated* scientist can any longer hurl the term 'anthropomorphism' at religion, for he knows that science itself cannot escape from anthropomorphism. But for his own muscular sensations he could not even conceive of force. Science is dominated by ideas which are

original products of the human spirit. Even the last great attempt to conceive Nature in non-human terms was an arbitrary attribution to Nature of the entirely human process of *selection*. But to explain the origin and variety of nature on the analogy of a single process of the human mind was unconsciously crude.

Science is bound to return (if it has not already done so) to the symbol of generation, not as an 'explanation' indeed, but as an envisagement of Reality in its perennial renewal and development. Let us first seek the meaning of biological facts. Let us see if it is possible to regard them as the embodiment of principles which belong to ultimate Reality.

It is indeed an amazing fact that every new organic individual however complex its structure may become, arises from a single fertilized cell. For its renewal the race returns ever to its primeval form in every new individual, and gathers up the racial experience in its development.

Now although the microscope has revealed the spermatozoon and the egg and the chromosomes, and all the essential facts of reproduction became known in the middle years of the nineteenth century,—it would be a pitiful error to imagine that the mystery of generation had been dissolved. To say, as a leading biologist says, that fertilization is essentially 'rejuvenescence' is suggestive, but he is unable to tell us the meaning of rejuvenescence. Growth may be as wonderful as birth, but just as it is pure assumption to think that birth can be resolved into the process of growth, so it is gratuitous to say that genesis is resolved into evolution.

Now that the facts of generation are known may we proceed to meanings? In the microscopic world the creative impulse which brings into being a new organism proceeds from the fertilization of a cell, even as the creative impulse is described as given to the world by the Spirit of God which brooded on the chaos.

The parallel between what takes place in the microscopic and unicellular world, and what occurs in the visible and personal world is too close to be accidental. The passivity which characterizes the female, the activity of the male, and their intimate union are the basic facts which in human marriage are carried into the psychic sphere. In the personal aspect there is evidence to show that if any one of these characteristics of true marriage is lacking—if the father-characteristic is weak, or the mother-care fails, or the spiritual union of the parents is impaired, then the offspring suffers in personality.

Man thus stands midway between the microscopic world of the unicellulars, to which each generation returns, and the world in its widest aspect, of which he is the microcosm. Thinking then of the Macrocosm, the universe that science deals with, it bears the aspect of innumerable potential homes of life, life which in its highest manifestation is reaching out to personality. We may suppose that the preliminary act of the Creator in bringing His own image into being was the differentiation of a material world from His own Spirit; that is, a sphere wherein spiritual activity other than His own may develop.

This differentiation of a material world from its creator has its classic symbol in the Chaos upon which the Spirit moves.

Into the habitable world life comes from the creator, manifested in the simplest organisms, centres of little worlds, reacting to universal laws, by which the universal end lives and grows within the individual will. The principle of individuality within the creature reflects the individuality of the Creator. The religious idea of God as Father implies that the innumerable human spirits derive their similarity and nature (their kinship) from one Supreme Spirit.

Let us next take the witness of psychology to the validity of this idea. Let us consider the fact of 'Self'—the most immediate fact of knowledge for each of us. For me, all the world and also my own body, are objects; my self—that which I call 'I'—is both object and subject. I am uniquely related to the objective world through a part of it, my own body. But only very loosely can my body be called my self, I am not identified with any part of it. But I am most clearly aware of my Self as subject when I speak of myself as having, feeling, striving, willing, knowing.

Without taking up the annoying but logically secure attitude of the 'Solipsist,' and regarding myself as the only real existence, we each of us are bound to acknowledge as 'real' the subject, and the subjective element of existence. Now it is when I thus consider my Self, as subject, the unificatory centre of my own little world—acting upon and influenced by that world—that it appears preposterous to suppose that the great world, within which my little world inheres, is without its Subjective Principle, its Self, its God. The more so does this conviction grip me on account of the uniformities that men have called laws, the inter-relatedness of all the parts, the coherence of things in a unity, that have led men to call it a Universe.

Neither organisms nor machines exist apart from minds; the difference between them being, that an organism has a controlling mind within it, whilst a machine is controlled by a mind outside itself. Whether indeed the Universe ought rightly to be called an Organism, I am unable to decide, yet increasingly an organic view of it is being taken. But even as my own Self may be said to be both immanent and transcendent, object and subject, it appears reasonable to suppose that there is a Subject of Universal experience who is not only intimately present in every event, but who also guides and plans.

Since the Subjective Reality is the surest thing we know; and since the improbability of our own Ego being solitarily unique is great enough for most men to reject such an idea, the presumption appears overwhelming that man's Self is related to the Universal Self in a most intimate manner, in origin and nature and destiny.

As well try to account for the existence of flowers apart from the Sun, as account for Man apart from God. And yet even this simile falls short. For it is not in physical characters that man's reflection of God is to be found—but in his rational thought we see the impressed mould of the rationality of the universe, in man's volition the only

clue to the nature of Causation, in man's capacity for ideals the image of the creative purpose.

*The Organic View of Man.* Men had, by dint of disregarding human nature, been able to imagine a universe comprised entirely and solely of physical forces, in which man has not only no home, but no foothold. In such a world man's thinking and willing and planning have to be regarded as illusions. And, alas for evolution, with such a world no account of man can be given. When, however, man is taken into account, then we are compelled to recognize that such qualities as are his, are implicit in the universe, and derived from outside himself.

The pioneers of the modern world who proceeded from experiments to principles and laws reposed a firm confidence in the affinity of the human mind with the Mind within Nature. 'We have, as signs and tokens that this is no false confidence, the technical discoveries upon which industrial civilization rests. To doubt the affinity of the mind of man with the laws of nature may do little harm theoretically; to doubt it in deed and practice is to stultify all human achievement.

The relation of man to the universe is organic; the relation of the human self to the Universal Self, however, is not to be expressed in terms of formal logic; for this relationship, when thus reviewed, that symbol which man in his simplicity has used through the ages insistently suggests itself again; viz., the relation of the child to the Father.

It is the human mind that requires accounting for more imperatively than any of its own ideas, even the idea of God. And it is immeasurably more rational to regard man's mind as being the reflex or mirror of the Mind implicit in the Universe—than it is to suppose that man's ideas of God are the 'projection' of his own image upon the background of the world.

The ghastly misgiving that the universe holds no higher intelligence than man himself is the product of the stifling subjectivity of an age in which the basic fact of man's organic unity with the cosmos has been obscured, and the roots of his nature cut. The psychological attack upon religion, which seeks to account for the idea of God as the foisting of a domestic obsession upon the outer world, is the counterpart of that preoccupation with the physical world which for so long a time led men to ignore or belittle their own subjective nature.

*The Principle of Individuality.* Now that we have regained our sense of the subjective reality underlying not only our own human nature, but all existence, we must find a new way of thinking about the world-process. The earlier evolution ideas were concerned with the 'flux' of things; the principle of individuality was obscured. The focus of interest to-day is in individuality; why do things hold together? What is the secret of the unity of an atom, or a solar system; of a living body, or the human mind?

Whatever it be, there is a difference in quality between the living and the non-living, whereby the former is able to utilize the latter, to build a little world of it and preside over it. That view of the lower forms of life that regards them as mechanically determined is as



unsatisfactory as that which regarded them as 'made for' the purposes of man. Better are they to be understood as wilful and wayward energies which have built into their very forms the modes of living, cumulatively chosen until they were imprisoned within forms of their own making. Mind peeps out feebly and disconnectedly at first, but it is characterized from the first by choice and volition, and resembles Deity in scope and power.

Not the least god-like characteristic of the simplest living individual is the power to reproduce its kind, even as itself may be regarded as a reproduction of the universal within the individual world. In parenthood this God-likeness achieves a further step by envioning the offspring. And in the main line of the upward evolution of life the elaboration of parenthood is successively achieved—of which principle the dominance of the *Mammals* is the expression. The prerequisite of humanity was the carrying of this principle further, in the prolongation of infancy, not merely with the object of protection but rather of educating those responses by which the personality is awakened.

We must not take for granted that it is known what personality consists in; even if we say it is the essentially human element, we may yet affirm that man has not completely attained it. Now personality is only evoked by a person. The mother is a child's complete environment as much after its birth as before. The mother is the mediator of the outer world to her infant, who only apprehends the world through her. But this exclusive attention to her child by the mother has been conditioned and made possible by the man whose business it was to fare forth and deal with the world. Finally, unless the world were such as yielded response to human effort, having unity and orderly sequence such that the human mind can take hold of and co-operate with, human existence would be impossible.

Thus a mystic picture has been drawn in three concentric circles, the centre of which is occupied by a babe whose mother's arms form the first encirclement; the second circle shews a peasant at work in the field; the outermost circle is that of the horizon with the stars beyond. Human nature must be seen against the background of the stars. Man's personality develops as he responds to the totality of the universe. Religion is the response of man to this totality. The soul of the child is led on by relations with Mother and Father and the widening social group to a harmony with the whole, which rests upon the twin principles of personality and love.

Now this adjustment of himself to society and the world has been secured to man through the ages by his religion; by all religions in some measure, but their very essence is embodied in the attitude of Jesus, who as typical Son of Man explicitly relies upon and communes with the Creator as Father.

Let us at this point bring the argument to a head. The 'enemy and avenger' (who makes the good fight possible) will make rejoinder that it is well for humanity in its infancy to envisage its relation to the universe thus; but that none the less religion itself is the prolongation of an infantile mentality, and that the conception of God as Father is

after all only a symbol of the Reality which must be assumed to be not unfriendly if man is to maintain his lot.

Which then is symbol, and which the Reality? As the whole is greater than the part, and the Universe greater than man, so we must think that our human parenthood is but the imperfect symbol of the Reality, of which therefore we may unhesitatingly speak, because no fitter language is available to us, as the Fatherhood of God.

The lengthening of the period of human infancy, which is one of the conditioning factors of human nature, is the key to the history of our race. The essential quality of man, as compared with the instinctively fully equipped animal world around him, is that he is ever a child, ever plastic, ever learning through his experiences. Thus the profoundest intuition that comes to man is that he is ever a child; a child of God.

Religion—which represents the reality of communion between man and God, and is thus based on broader foundations than critical reflection—has received a temporary check, owing to the vastly wider horizon which has suddenly opened to man and to the harsh circumstances which conceal the providential order. Only however by a renewed perception that the universe is his home, will man have courage to grip the circumstances, only in the faith that man's strength and tenderness are grounded in Reality can he go on. Of that Reality not the abstractions of the philosophers nor the concepts of the scientists give so adequate an account as the spontaneous language of faith:

He views his children with delight;  
He sees their hope, He knows their fear,  
And looks, and loves His image there.

J. PARTON MILUM.

## THE SAINTS OF THE IRISH MISSION

A NOTICEABLE feature of English Church history is the strain of Puritan Evangelical teaching which runs through the records and reveals itself from time to time in Lollard, Quaker, Methodist, &c. In this type of church life you find the emphasis placed rather on preaching the Gospel than on questions of administration and organization, orders, order or even creed. The Bible is given priority over the Institution. Experience is more important than Ritual and Forms, the life than polity. Now Bishop Lightfoot is not the only one who has seen the first expression of this attitude in the Irish Saints who brought the Gospel Message to the Northern parts of England in the seventh century. The learned bishop, once wrote that 'Aidan not Augustine is the Apostle of England,' yet so often Augustine and Canterbury are mentioned whilst Aidan and Lindisfarne are forgotten. A few words about this Irish Mission may not be out of place in these times.

In the closing days of the Roman power in Britain Patrick was taken from his father's house in South Wales and brought as a slave to Ireland. After seven years' slavery and many wanderings in Gaul (France) he returned home, but he could not rest. There was the call of the Irish from the Wood of Foelclut, 'Come and walk with us, holy youth,' and there was the call of God in his own soul, the call of 'One who died for' him, and after delay and some opposition on account of lack of culture, he was sent by the Church in Britain as bishop and evangelist to Ireland, A.D. 432. He has left a memorable, and beautiful account of his call and ministry in his 'Confessions.' 150 years later a great Irish monk, Columba, left Ireland and established himself with monks at Iona, and here they formed a monastic settlement, simple, frugal, disciplined, a family life of lovers who had all things common, with Columba as their Father Abbot. Work in the fields, copying of MSS., close study of the Bible, and much prayer, made up the daily life of these monks, but they were missionaries as well as monks, and from this island base Columba evangelized Scotland. To this island came Oswald, an exiled prince of the Northumbrian royal family, and here he was converted from heathenism (for England owing to the Saxon invasions had relapsed into heathenism) and became a strong, devout Christian. Restored to the throne of Northumbria, he sent to Iona for a missionary who could teach his people the Christian message, and Aidan was sent. Canon Bright says 'Oswald was altogether a prince of men, one born to attract a general enthusiasm of admiration, love and reverence.' Words justified by the available evidence.

Aidan is one of the noblest of saints and at Lindisfarne he lived with his men whom he trained to be as he was, missionaries and evangelists, and Cuthbert, Chad, Hilda and many others exhibited the same gracious, humble, tender, lovable spirit they had seen in Aidan. So Oswald and Aidan went up and down the country with this glorious message of Salvation; Aidan preaching, Oswald interpreting, and they brought the North and Midlands back to Christianity. This is one of the great periods of Christianity in this country. No one can read the pages of Bede without feeling the rare charm of these beautiful Irish Saints and their witness to religion as essential love. Britain once gave Patrick to Ireland. Ireland repaid the debt when she gave back Aidan to Britain. In the *Confessions of Patrick*, Adamnan's *Life of Columba* and Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*, the original authorities, we can distinguish truth from legend; and see the real glory of the Saints of the Irish Mission.

(1). *These saints were not under Roman authority.* Patrick never once mentions the Pope and the Roman See, and definitely rules out Papal commission by ascribing his call to God alone. He may have been actually ordained by Germanus of Auxerre, and probably was sent as a representative of the British Church, but primarily, and this alone mattered to him, his call was direct from God.

Now it is known that Columba was the leader of the Iona Mission. At the Council of Whitby (A.D. 664), called by Oswy, brother and successor

to Oswald, his authority is in definite opposition to the authority of Rome. Adamnan's *Life of Columba* knows of no appeal to Rome. Aidan and his friends look to Iona not to Rome for guidance in the matter of the date of Easter, nature of Tonsure, &c. The issue of Whitby was something more than these details, however. It was whether Iona or Rome was to have the last word in English Church life. The fact is Ireland was the most Protestant as well as the most Christian country in the West, rightly called in those days the Island of Saints. Augustine may have brought the Roman form of Christianity to Canterbury, but Canterbury and Rome meant simply nothing to Aidan at Lindisfarne.

(2). *The Mission was definitely Biblical* in its emphasis. Patrick quotes freely from the Old Latin Versions of the Bible. His mind is soaked in Biblical thought and phrase. Columba and his monks studied the Psalms and Gospels in their cells, copied Bible MSS. in beautifully coloured books. Bede tells us more than once that their only desire was to conform to the 'apostolical and prophetic writings.' The Bible meant as much to these men as it did to Wycliffe and Wesley.

(3). They were definitely *Preachers of the Gospel* discovered in the Bible and vindicated in their experience. Think of Patrick—what a great experience lies behind his 'Confession'! He speaks of the wonderful Grace which had reached and lifted him and all the mercies and blessings which came to him from God in Jesus through the sacrifice of the Cross. Patrick loved God and trusted Him and longed to proclaim Him to others. So with Columba, Aidan, Chad, Cuthbert. This is the message of the Cross. 'God whom I love,' cried Patrick, and his hymn is all about Christ. 'Christ is my Druid,' cried Columba. Bede tells us they preached the 'Redemption of the World through Jesus Christ the Mediator between God and man.' These men were apostles in the New Testament sense of that word. They were 'sent men,' sent to proclaim a great Salvation of wonderful grace and love. They were ever conscious of the Divine Lover who had sent them.

(4). *To this Preaching of the Word, Polity, &c., was ever subordinate.* The exact nature of their polity and organization is not easily discovered. There is a most marked reserve or indifference shown in these matters. There were three orders of the ministry: bishops, presbyters, deacons, indicated in Patrick's Confessions, and in Adamnan's *Life*, and no doubt each order had its prerogatives and privileges and duties, but there is no diocesan episcopate suggested.

The reader is at once struck with the very large number of bishops in the Irish Church. Tirechan in his seventh-century life of Patrick mentions 450, and in the Catalogue of Saints (eighth century) 300 are mentioned. We are told they were founders of churches. Bishops seem to be like so many Congregational ministers linked together by a personal loyalty to Patrick, for each church seems to have a bishop in those days and indeed there is some evidence that some churches were governed by colleges of bishops. Then later on we find bishops in quite subordinate positions governed by Abbot Presbyters.

Columba was himself only a presbyter and as such governed the whole Iona Mission. He and his successors seem to have governed in conjunction with a college of seniors or elders, for such a group is said to have chosen Aidan and ordained him as bishop for England. It is, of course, quite possible that bishops were at hand actually to convey the grace of orders, but the authority and government rested with Presbyters in quite the Presbyterian manner. In England the authority rested in a series of bishops, but they were more like itinerant evangelists than diocesan bishops. At any rate that is the impression Aidan makes as he journeys to and fro preaching, teaching and baptizing. He preached wherever Oswald ruled, and there were certainly no defined diocesan areas. All these different methods show clearly that the Irish Mission was not committed to any particular form of polity or church order. Obviously the main endeavour was the proclamation of the Gospel and questions of government, &c., were regarded as *means* rather than *ends* and therefore subordinate to the Main End in view, which was the preaching of the Gospel. One feels that with these men, as with Wesley and his followers, everything must ultimately lead to that which to them was a passion—the desire to save souls. Efforts to discover diocesan episcopacy in Patrick's case have failed and suggestions that he created a diocesan system which broke down is a supposition only, completely unsupported by any actual evidence.

(5). In those days the *Life counted as purest test of the Faith* professed. The beauty of Patrick's life, his humility, earnestness, devotion and love is stamped on all his writings. He lived as he taught and could safely appeal to the testimony of his own life. The majesty and grandeur of Columba can be seen through the marvel and miracle of Adamnan's panegyric. His intense and passionate devotion to his task, his hold on the affections of his people, his hatred of cruelty and injustice, his sympathy with sorrow and need, his willingness to reconcile enmities, all reflect a character of rare nobility. Add to this the sweetness of the character of Aidan as depicted by Bede, that life so superior to vainglory and avarice, that industry and keeping of heavenly commandments, that tenderness in comforting distress and relieving the poor, that love of peace and charity, continence and humility, which qualities make Aidan one of the most attractive and lovable of all the saints. The people believed in these men; they trusted and loved them, for their sole duty, as Bede puts it, was to 'preach, baptize, visit sick and care for souls.' They lived, loved, and served, and the world recognized genuine Christianity. They were apostles concerned for the apostolic method of living. As with Wesley, whom Aidan in many ways closely resembles, religion is love to God and man. The life was the final test. They preached Jesus by living his life of love. What were prerogatives and priestly powers compared with this!

Of course they accepted much of the teaching of those days. The movement was celibate, ascetic; in some cases there was exaggerated self-denial and too rigorous a discipline. They accepted the general



teaching of the Church on the Confessional and the Penitentiary. The system of penance was associated with exile, pilgrimages, fasting, stripes. The respect for great men led to an interest in their relics. The Sign of the Cross came to have a dangerous tendency towards magic. They believed in demons and angels; they heard voices, saw visions; they lived in a world of miracles, but behind all this there was the Gospel, the Grace of God; Jesus and His Redeeming Love. 'God whom I love.' 'Christ my Druid.'

It is generally believed that the decision of the Council of Whitby to accept the Roman rather than the Irish date for Easter meant progress. Lightfoot, Bright, and even Hodgkin have suggested that it was well for England to turn south to the Continent for closer contact with its civilization. This judgement however, cannot be a final one. The Merovingian civilization in France was corrupt, degenerate; and Papal Policy in Italy was very secular and the result of Whitby's decision was a certain decline in character and spirituality admitted even by Bede. The difference is seen when one compares Wilfrid, the Romanizing bishop, powerful, arrogant, wealthy, provocative, with Aidan, gentle, humble, lovable; or when one compares Theodore, the learned, very able ecclesiastical statesman, with Chad, whom he compelled to be reordained because his orders were not considered sufficiently valid or regular. If progress is to be measured by organization, noble architecture, stained glass windows, golden crowns and silver images, gorgeous coloured robes, &c., then the decision of Whitby meant progress, for there was certainly an advance in all these directions. Fine stone churches took the place of the wooden churches of the Celtic monks. But if progress is to be measured by faith, humility, love, the sense of Heaven, munificent sacrificial service and the inward assurance of Salvation, then Whitby did not spell progress, but reaction.

England lost something when those Irish monks left Lindisfarne for Iona, yet it was not all lost. To Wesley as to Aidan, opinions, orders, politics were secondary to faith, hope, and love. Both will say Religion is Love and Perfect Love the standard. Lightfoot is right. The spirit of Reformation was embodied in these early Saints. It is the succession of apostolic preaching and living which is the glory of history and not just a succession through orders and order. We Methodists, now united, claim to be in this grand succession, and we look back beyond Wesley to all who have proclaimed the Gospel and counted the preaching of Jesus and the living His life of love the main task of the Church, which is the true fellowship of those who love Him.

D. W. LOWIS.

# Recent Literature

## THEOLOGY AND APOLOGETICS

*Faith and Society.* By Maurice B. Reckitt. (Longmans & Co. 15s.)

THIS book, to use the words of the author, 'seeks to present a systematic survey of the basis, the structure, and the task, present and future, of the Christian Social Movement, in England primarily, but with some reference also to the position in the United States.' Though the author disclaims any intention of giving an adequate history of this Movement, yet the review of its progress in Britain and America—which forms Part I of the volume—will be found by the reader to be quite satisfying. The information respecting the different societies in the two countries which since 1848 have stressed the social application of Christianity is comprehensive and exhaustive.

Those who are interested in constructive proposals will turn to Part II, which in our judgement might fittingly have formed a separate volume. Here Mr. Reckitt discusses the elements of a Christian Sociology for to-day. In the course of his treatment he outlines his view of a Christian order of society in Politics, and especially in Economics. That there is urgent need for serious thinking on this subject by all Christians the reader of this book will realize keenly. Who, indeed, can deny the statement on p. 80 that industrial civilization is far from meeting 'the requirements of the physician and the priest'? Actually it is destructive of the bodies, and degrading to the souls, of men. At present the Church of Christ tends to be one-sided in its interest: it 'is turned inwards in devotion, it does not express itself outwards in a clear-cut and defined attitude to the issues and challenges of the age' (p. 453).

To what does the author trace this menace to the health of the bodies and souls of men? Largely to a disastrous system of economics. It boots little to propose changes like Socialism, or Profit-sharing; for the real cause of human ills, economically speaking, lies beyond the reach of such remedies. The truth is that the world is in the grip of 'money power' (p. 420). 'The ultimate initiative (in industry) resides in the veiled monopoly of cosmopolitan finance, working through a mechanism disguised and scarcely anywhere understood, and operated by a very few, who are virtually anonymous' (p. 297). This cosmopolitan force can interfere with the industrial life of a whole nation, and in particular exerts its baneful influence in the direction of price-regulation.

The remedy which Mr. Reckitt favours is practically the Douglas Social Credit System. It is argued that the use of the Social Dividend with consumers' credits would make it possible to re-establish

the sound Mediaeval ideals of the vocational nature of work, control by the workers, and the just price. Sometimes, the reader is made to feel that a mere change of economic system will suffice to cure our ills; but this would be to misunderstand Mr. Reckitt, who throughout writes from the standpoint of a Christian who emphasises the doctrine of the Incarnation and the practice of its lessons. Poverty amid Plenty is certainly a tragedy; but, unless increased consuming power is sanctified, humanity may be busy with 'illth' instead of wealth and welfare. We earnestly commend this important book to all who are anxious about the message of the Gospel to the present age. Not that the average Christian can be expected himself to decide the question of the soundness of Mr. Reckitt's diagnosis and remedy, for he himself confesses that both are 'highly controversial' (p. 421). Even professed economists nowadays speak with varying voices. Nevertheless on these matters all possible expert knowledge should be obtained. To this end the Christian Social Council, with its Research Department, and the Social Service Unions of the Churches claim the sympathy and support of all earnest and wise Christians.

E. W. HIRST.

*The Religion of the Bahá'is.* By J. R. Richards, B.A. (The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. 7s. 6d.)

THIS book should be greatly appreciated by missionaries working in the Near East who find their task more difficult through ignorance of the history and teaching of Bahá'ism. Mr. Richards (a missionary himself) realizing the lack of suitable literature on the subject, has given us in comparatively small compass just what every one who has contacts with Bahá'ism ought to know. The author repudiates the idea that Islam presents a united front, (lacking in Christianity) pointing out such a position to be impossible owing to hatred and bitterness engendered when Islam first became divided over the vexed question of the Mahdi (The Guided One or The Promised One). Some sects look for the coming of 'Him whom God shall manifest,' others claim that he has come, though they disagree as to who actually was the Mahdi. Naturally other questions of minor importance are involved.

Mírzá 'Alí Mohammed (the Báb) became the founder of the Bábís, a sect of considerable importance in Persia in the middle of the nineteenth century. He claimed to be sent by God as a Herald to prepare the way for the coming of a Great One. Mr. Richards in a very valuable chapter on the teaching of the Báb stresses the point that the latter's statement as to preparing the way for another greater than himself facilitated a little later the claim of Bahá'u'llah to be the Mahdi. 1817 saw the birth of Mírzá Hosein 'Alí (Bahá'u'llah) who was destined to become the founder of a new religion Bahá'ism. 'From a background of intrigue and hatred, of treachery and bloodshed, there came forth a new faith which was later to adopt as its slogan the words "Universal

Peace." Acre became the centre of interest and here the new religion was developed. In its early stages Bahā'ism was to all intents and purposes a new development of Islamic thought, but when Dr. Kheirullāh carried a modification of the teaching to America and Hippolyte Drefus to France the whole character of the movement became changed. 'Abdu'l-Bahá who succeeded Bahá'u'llah adapted the teachings of Bahā'ism to Western movements and Western thought, but the twelve basic principles examined by Mr. Richards are found to be without foundation, 'a gay cloak wrapped around a skeleton.' Salvation is not intellectual, it goes deeper than that. The power of God which can save men from themselves, springs from knowledge of Him and this was beyond the power of Abdul to give. He never came under the influence of true religion. Mr. Richards finds that 'Bahā'ism is a denial of all that is fundamental in the Christian religion.'

GERTRUDE A. HORNE.

*Myth and Ritual.* Essays edited by S. H. Hooke. (Oxford University Press. 10s. 6d.)

THE essays in this volume are contributed by seven acknowledged experts and are prefaced by a valuable Foreword from Canon Simpson, Oriel Professor at Oxford, who arranged for six of the essays delivered at Oxford; the editor arranged other seven as Public Lectures in the University of London. The fascination of the theme of myth and ritual attracted large audiences and the essays will be read with equal interest. Dr. Simpson makes some discriminating comments on Fundamentalists and Higher Critics. He thinks that manifold as is our debt to German Protestantism, we are in danger of being too much influenced by their view of the sources of the Pentateuch. The essays in this volume on myth and ritual within their Hebrew environment do not fall into that error. They give a picture of them in the great Hebrew festivals as linked to primitive man's first gropings after the Divine but culminating 'when God became man that man might become as He is.' Professor Hooke deals with the myth and ritual pattern of the ancient East. These are then traced in Ancient Egypt, Babylon and Canaan. Dr. Hollis thinks that the sun-worship, which the prophets show to have persisted so tenaciously in the Temple, was due to the fact that from a remote antiquity those precincts had been a leading centre of such worship. That conception only gradually retreated into the background. The Early Hebrew festival ritual, the Initiatory Rituals and Hebrew myths are considered in other lectures. Certain aspects of the beliefs and rituals here reconstructed met with the strongest condemnation from the great prophets but the myths remained in popular thought as stories, purified, no doubt, but still retaining many of their earlier characteristics. Dr. T. H. Robinson finds much of the language of the New Testament Apocalypse dictated by these old stories. The essays illustrate afresh one of the permanent principles in the development of the spiritual life

of mankind: "the path of the just is as the dawning light, that shineth more and more unto the perfect day." Twenty illustrations add much to the understanding of the essays.

*Treasure-House of the Living Religions.* Compiled and edited by Robert Ernest Hume. (Scribner's Sons. 12s. 6d.)

THIS volume is certainly unique. It compresses the quintessence of the religious world since the tenth century before Christ into 300 pages, adding Reference Notes, bibliography and other matter which fills more than 200 pages. The quotations, prose as well as poetry, are clearly arranged in lines and grouped into three parts: Faith in the Perfect God; Man and his perfecting; Man and his social Relationships. A programme of Joint Worship arranged as a Responsive Reading is of interest as an attempt to show where the 134 documents from which the book is compiled find common ground. Each section is headed by Christian passages and these are followed by Confucianism, Hinduism, Islam and the sacred books of other religions. The work represents the handling of 106,423 pages of sacred literature. Mr. Hume says 'the only religions which have managed to survive the devastations of time are the ones which possess a canon of sacred scriptures revered as authoritative depositories of saving truths.' The volume invites careful study of passages which represent thirty centuries of search after truth and the light which has guided them in their quest. The coloured jacket represents temples of the various faiths. With Chartres Cathedral as the backbone, the synagogue in Fifth Avenue, New York, and shrines and temples of eastern lands, Mr. A. C. Webb has made it no unworthy epitome of Mr. Hume's encyclopedic volume.

*The Fool hath said.* By Cyril Alington, D.D. (Longmans & Co. 4s. 6d.)

*The Holy Ghost the Comforter.* By Peter Green, M.A. (Longmans & Co. 4s. 6d.)

*The Christian in his Blindness.* By W. H. Elliott (Longmans & Co. 2s. 6d.)

DR. ALINGTON holds that the more we look into the Christian religion the more reason we shall find to believe in it. It still contains the one real hope for a very troubled world, and offers the one intelligible explanation of human life. As Dean Inge says in a Preface, Dr. Alington has 'drawn up a really exhaustive list of the popular arguments against Christianity, and has answered them in a way which should give the objector much ground for thought, if he is willing to think. The answers are always fair.' He begins with the existence of God, passes on to the future life, the existence of evil, the questions of prayer, worship and foreign missions. The whole discussion is carried on with sympathy and insight and will make a deep



impression on honest thinkers who seek light on many grave questions of religion.

Canon Peter Green discusses the nature and work of the Holy Spirit. He seeks to know Him through His work in the universe and in man; in creation, regeneration and conversion, edification and sanctification, in the Sacraments and in the Church. He feels that 'the sacrament itself is nothing; no more than the cup which holds the water for which a man thirsts. Christ is all we need. And the Holy Spirit has nothing to give us but "the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ." Sacraments are but "the outward and visible signs" of that grace, channels through which our faith may ascend to God and His gifts descend to us.' This catholic and evangelical study of the person and work of the Holy Spirit was much needed and deserves careful attention.

The Vicar of St. Michael's, Chester Square, has written for the man who is anxious to see more clearly into the things that matter, and his readers, like the Bishop of London, will admire his frankness, humanity and faith. To him the tragedy of modern civilization lies in its hopelessness. We must face up to life decisively. 'To attempt a compromise, to serve God a little and to serve self a little is to make a lie in the soul.' He feels that no kind of religion is worth talking about that does not touch the heart of man and makes happy use of childhood to show that God cannot be otherwise than love, and that man cannot do otherwise than worship and adore. God is like Christ and the Gospels make us feel 'what beauty there was in His goodness, what grace in all His words and works.' Another chapter lays stress 'on the need and the opportunity of a Sunday spent in due and deliberate recollection of what we believe, what we are, and what we long to be. Sunday gives us time. And to pray as Christ prayed, as the Saints prayed, takes time.' The last words on the future life will comfort many. Our loved ones have gone into a busy world. Christ abolished death by bringing life and immortality to light. 'He revealed the impotence of the grave to keep prisoner an immortal spirit.' The book is a rich companion to those of Dr. Alington and Canon Peter Green.

*The Way of Discipleship.* By H. Bisseker, M.A. (Epworth Press. 2s. 6d.)

THESE sermons preached by the Headmaster of The Leys School make their appeal to those who are not yet far advanced along the path of Christian discipleship. They fall into four groups: The Call and discipleship; The Disciple's attitude to Life; Aids to Discipleship; The Disciple's Service. Every subject is handled in a lucid and practical way and the time-limit of fifteen minutes really increases their effect. They approach subjects of character and conduct in a way that arrests attention and leaves a strong impression of the need for decision and courage. Failure is recognized but

is made a spur to face it with the assurance that 'the greatest spiritual forces of the Universe will fight on your side, and you will conquer.' Mastery of circumstances; riches; pleasure; duty; and other subjects are treated with sympathy and insight into young minds and hearts and they are brought step by step to realize that the only sure foundation for human happiness and human freedom is the teaching of Christ. It is a golden book of sermons which cannot have failed to mould manly characters.

*Everyman's Talmud.* By the Rev. Dr. S. Cohen. (Dent & Sons, 7s. 6d.)

ENGLISH readers have been well provided with selections, tales and wise sayings from the Talmud, but we have had no comprehensive survey of this great Jewish body of literature. Dr. Cohen has at last given us a summary of its teachings on Religion, Ethics, Folklore, and Jurisprudence. There is a growing interest in the subject and it is hoped that this volume will help to a better understanding of the thoughts and aims of the great teachers of Israel after the Biblical age. It has been no light task for the literature is vast in extent and seems to the modern mind to be without system and order. A subject is not treated fully in any one passage, but has to be gleaned and pieced together from the entire field. Most of the passages have been rendered anew for this work. The Introduction describes the Historical Antecedents; the Mishnah and its Contents; and Gamala with Midrash. The work is then considered in thirteen sections, beginning with the Doctrine of God; God and the Universe and then proceeding to the Doctrine of Man in domestic, social, moral and physical life. Chapters on Jurisprudence and the Hereafter close the survey. The God whom the Talmud represents was a personal reality. Inquiry as to Natural science was strongly discouraged as a menace to religious faith. The Rabbis also considered that the problems of the world were more than sufficient to occupy the mind. It was held that the righteous of all peoples would inherit the bliss of the Hereafter. Hillel's motto was: 'Be of the disciples of Aaron, loving peace and pursuing peace, loving your fellow-creatures and drawing them near to the Torah.' That the human being was created in the image of God gave him supreme importance in the economy of the universe, life had to be interpreted and conducted in the light of the purpose of man's creation to afford him an opportunity of glorifying the Maker of the Universe. To spend one's existence in toiling for material possessions is senseless, since wealth of that kind has only a transitory value. The Talmud made the Jews feel that though the Temple was destroyed, God could still be approached by charity, justice, Torah, study and prayer. Life is then viewed in its various relationships, the golden age was in the future and imagination ran riot in the attempt to envisage the world as it would appear under the transforming hand of the Messiah. The question of the Hereafter is discussed in a final chapter of special interest

when compared with New Testament reading. Dr. Cohen has certainly given us a volume which lights up Jewish teaching between 200 B.C. and A.D. 500 and no one can study it without an enhanced estimate of the wisdom and the reverence of these old masters of Hebrew religion and philosophy.

*The Two Treatises of Servetus on the Trinity*, now first translated into English by Earl Morse Wilbur, D.D. (Harvard Theological Studies XVI. Milford. 14s. net.)

THIS extra number of the *Harvard Theological Review* contains three writings of Servetus, entitled respectively 'On the Errors of the Trinity,' 'Dialogues on the Trinity,' and 'On the Righteousness of Christ's Kingdom.' In his admirable introduction Dr. Wilbur summarizes the teaching of the *Errors* and the *Dialogues* shewing how greatly they influenced the development of religious thought in the Reformation period and later. Although Servetus was the fountain-head of anti-trinitarian tendencies, it is maintained that 'nevertheless he was not an anti-trinitarian, . . . nor can any one who reads his little books call him a Unitarian or even an Arian. His doctrine has closest affinities with that of Sabellius.' To the Harvard University Press students of historical theology are greatly indebted for the publication of these excellent translations. From them a clear understanding of the doctrines of Servetus may be gained. He conceived of the Trinity as 'a series of *dispositions* of the divine being for different offices,' but he was passionately attached to 'Christ as the complete embodiment of God in human form.' It is good to remember that 'reverent and grateful sons of Calvin' have erected 'an expiatory monument' almost on the spot where Servetus died at the stake as a heretic.

*Studies in the Birth of the Lord*. By Elwood Worcester. (Charles Scribner & Sons. 10s. 6d.)

A STUDY of outstanding works on the birth of Christ has led to this survey of the whole question. The conclusion reached is that 'There is no justification for making it (the Virgin birth) a doctrine by which either the Church or the faith of Christians stands or falls. If it were otherwise, surely Jesus, or at least one of the Apostles after His death, would have informed us of it.' The narratives in Matthew and Luke are discussed, and the apocryphal Gospels, the Syriac Palimpsest, the early texts, the genealogies and other documents are examined with much detail. The statement that 'the New Testament is to be regarded as the glorification rather than the history of Jesus seems to us to vitiate the argument. To establish His sinlessness it was considered necessary to deny Him a human father.' The concluding chapter regards the birth stories 'as pure and lofty attempts to glorify Jesus, the only being in the long procession of humanity who deserves our absolute love and praise.' Theologians will study this book with special interest though many will not be able to accept its conclusions.

*Christian Science and Christian Faith.* By Breenes Miller.  
(Epworth Press. 2s. 6d.)

THIS book has grown out of pastoral experience in London and in the North. Mr. Millar has been impressed by the growth of the 'Church of Christ, Scientist.' He describes its services and attributes its success to its claim to banish pain. That brings him to his first sermon on Health and Religion. The Christian religion sanctifies the whole of personality by saving from worry and from moral and spiritual guilt. The teaching of Christian Science is then examined frankly and without prejudice and a fourth Sermon probes into the meaning of 'The prayer of faith' in a way that will help many readers. It is a timely book, and treats the whole question with good sense and fine feeling.

*The Faiths of Mankind.* By William Paton, M.A. (S.C. Movement. 2s. 6d.)

THE way in which the great religions deal with great problems is here considered under seven heads: Man and the World; God; Sin, Suffering and Salvation; The Good Life; The world to come; Mohammed, Buddha and Christ; The Case for the Christian World Mission. Mr. Zia says 'No one in Chinese history has ever had a clear conception of God. If only Confucius had known God a little better, the history of China would have been totally different and perhaps much more encouraging.' Islam subordinates everything to the doctrine of the Omnipotence of God. Nowhere in the world do we find the same glorious certainty about the love and goodness of God as in Christianity. It 'stands firm in the claim that the Power transcendent over the universe dwelt, in the fulness of heart and will, in One who lived a man on earth.' Another chapter shows that Muhammedan morals are tied meticulously to him. Shaving or wearing a beard is considered in view of the Prophet's example. The treatment of the volume is very suggestive and 'The case for a Christian World Mission' is impressively stated.

*Christ in the Creed.* By W. Graham Scroggie. (Marshall, Morgan & Scott. 1s.)

THIS little book will help many to grasp the seven great declarations about our Lord in the Apostles' Creed. The nature of faith is clearly shown, and the treatment of the Virgin Birth is helpful. We do not agree that if Joseph was Christ's father, He was not sinless, though the rest of the discussion is excellent. It is a lucid and thoughtful piece of work.

*'My First Book of Prayers.'*

THIS is compiled by Bertine Buxton, illustrated by Horace J. Knowles and published at 1s. 6d. by The Athenæum Press. The prayers are simple and heart-felt; the illustrations are delightful. Luther's 'Away in a Manger' makes a happy close to the dainty little book.

## HISTORY, BIOGRAPHY, TRAVEL

*Books and Readers in Ancient Greece and Rome.* By F. G. Kenyon. (Clarendon Press. 5s.)

SIR FREDERICK KENYON delivered three lectures on this subject at King's College in March, 1932. His object was to supplement the standard works on ancient book-production, especially with regard to the period when papyrus was the principal material in use. Discoveries in Egypt during the last two generations have greatly extended our knowledge, and Mr. Beatty's remarkable collection of papyrus codices has thrown much light on the transitional form of book which appears to have had a special vogue among the Christian Community in Egypt. His four sections deal with the Use of Books in Ancient Greece; The Papyrus Roll; Books and Reading at Rome; Vellum and the Codex. There are nine illustrations of a papyrus roll open and unopened, of students and readers with rolls, of pens and inkpots, and a two page representation of the Heidelberg papyrus of Minor Prophets. Only about a generation ago it was held that writing was practically unknown to the Homeric age of the ninth century B.C.; now we have writing which goes back to 2200 B.C. The Iliad and Odyssey were composed in writing Sir Frederick believes. Ptolemy's Library at Alexandria about 300 B.C. gathered 200,000 volumes within about five years. We have actual specimens of writing on skins in Egypt from about 2000 B.C. Papyrus was, however, the main vehicle of literature in the classical world and many details are given of its size and use. There was no Latin literature before the third century B.C. when it came into existence as a result of Greek influence. Literature was fully domiciled in Rome in the first century B.C., and with the reign of Augustus libraries became common. Herculaneum was destroyed in A.D. 79. Its excavation in 1754 showed a small room in which were hundreds of rolls of papyrus, charred almost to cinders among the remains of bookcases ornamented with inlaid woods. The last lecture on 'Vellum and the Codex' shows that the codex form was in use in the second century, and it is possible that Irenæus, 'to whom the four Gospels stood apart by themselves as a record of the Saviour's life, knew them as a single volume.' The decline of papyrus is definitely dated to the fourth century, when the Roman gentry, withdrawn more and more from active political life, cultivated literary studies with genuine zeal. The book is such as only Sir Frederick Kenyon could have given us.

*Three Friends.* By Robert Bridges. (Milford. 7s. 6d.)

THESE memoirs of Digby Mackworth Dolben, Richard Watson Dixon, Henry Bradley were originally prefixed to volumes of poems or other writings of the three authors, but it is a real pleasure to have them



brought together in this way. Dolben's later work was 'not only of rare promise but occasionally of the rarest attainment, and its beauties are original.' The workings of his troubled mind make a pathetic story and his death in bathing was a tragic close to a gifted life. Methodists will feel special interest in Richard Watson Dixon, whose friends became infected with his grace. His poetry and his historical insight stand out in this discriminating estimate and the letter from his father, Dr. Dixon, in the Notes is exquisite. There is also a little pen portrait of Richard Watson by Dr. Dixon which is not less effective. The sketch of Henry Bradley, who devoted forty years of his life to the Oxford Dictionary, is a noble tribute to a man of extraordinary insight and breadth of linguistic knowledge. He told Dr. Bridges that 'his impregnable faith in the spiritual governance of mankind was, he believed, mainly determined in him by his brave father's example, who, in the early Sheffield days, was living in poverty, having renounced his worldly prospects rather than trifle with his conscience. The elders obtained a good report. The significance of this strikes deep, he had here come face to face with reality; and his faith in things unseen, and even in a future state, and his reasoned acceptance of the spirit of Christ's teaching governed his life.' Amusing stories, acute literary criticism, and ripe wisdom make these lives a rare treasure.

*Interpretations 1931—1932.* By Walter Lippman. Selected and arranged by Allan Nevins. (Allen & Unwin, 10s. 6d.)

MR. LIPPMAN is editor of the *New York World* and asked his friend and former colleague to select and edit this volume of articles. The articles expound ideas which have permanent value and afford a valuable record of a year of turmoil and anxiety. The depression in the United States is a subject of world-wide interest. Mr. Lippman thinks that as it took several centuries to solve the problem of scarcity it will take long generations to solve the management of plenty. It is a fallacy to regard the prosperity of 1928 as normal and capable of automatic restoration. Incomes will have to adjust themselves to the lower level of prices. Demoralization is the principal peril, and the American leaders have shown moral apathy. The best men are looking for leaders who will talk to the people about duty, sacrifice and discipline; about their responsibility to the world and to posterity, about all the things which make a people self-respecting, serene, and confident. The only political need is for simple statesmanship of a high order. Mr. Hoover has 'no well-considered conception of his office and of his own purposes. He spends his energies largely in fields where the President has no powers and no responsibility. His theory that America is a self-contained nation capable of recovery but for shocks from abroad is, on the face of it, paradoxical. Such a nation would really be immune from the impact of foreign conditions.' The task of Congress, the war debts, the Lausanne Conference,

American policy in the Far East and other important subjects come under consideration. Then Mr. Lippman turns to the political scene in Europe, paying tribute to Mr. MacDonald's courage in breaking with his own party. 'Paris is no longer supreme. Great Britain has resumed its ancient position among the powers of Europe.' The articles throw much light on American conditions, social and political, and on the general outlook. The pages given to 'Personalities of the Day' deal with the Lindbergh case, showing the need to put some reasonable restraint upon the right of the press 'to make instantaneous copy out of clues which are vital in the detection of a crime.'

*The Case for China.* By H. C. Thomson. (Allen & Unwin 10s. 6d.)

THE author was a correspondent of *The Times* during the Chitral Expedition and for the *Manchester Guardian* during the allied operations against the Boxers. These experiences are recorded in *China and the Powers* and *The Chitral Campaign*. In *The Case for China* he tests the attitude of the Powers and their dealings with China by the 'ordinary ethical standards' and is convinced that the main responsibility for China's present state rests upon the Powers and not upon China. The author, aided by other competent authorities, presents the case for China—a case that amounts to an indictment of the aggressive policy of Japan. He tries to be fair to Japan and does not forget that Southern Manchuria was ceded to them by the Treaty of Shimonoseki in 1895, and that later they were obliged by the Powers to give it up. He recognizes too, that during the Russian War, Japan saved Manchuria for China and that she has developed it at great expense, under treaties made both with China and with Russia. Moreover, Treaty rights have been continually violated and protests have been of no avail.

China admits the validity of the claim that Japan saved Manchuria from Russia, but affirms that ever since Japan has been endeavouring 'to obtain a strangle-hold of it for themselves.' They deny the validity of the Treaty rights claimed by the Japanese in vindication of their aggressive policy. They also affirm that Japan has intentionally aggravated the difficulties with which they were confronted in their efforts, not without success, to restore order and good government. Nor should it be forgotten that China too, has expended immense sums on the internal development of the country. It is further noted that as an outlet for her population Manchuria is of little value to Japan—the Japanese will not emigrate to so cold a country. This is emphasized by the fact that millions of Chinese Settlers have migrated to Manchuria and less than three hundred thousand Japanese have settled there. Manchuria, however, means much to Japan. Japan controls huge natural resources of these Chinese provinces, monopolises them as her exclusive market, and the economic gains far outweigh the cost of dispatching a few thousand troops to that region. Indeed, the Japanese Military Authorities are determined to hold Manchuria

whatever the World Powers may say or do, simply because 'the control of Manchuria is the only hope of saving Japan from financial and commercial ruin.' The difficulties confronting the League are increased by the fact that the Japanese Government is not in a position to carry out their assurances and undertakings, because, under their Constitution, the Japanese military authorities are entirely responsible to the Mikado. They know, too, how soon national hatreds are roused and neither America nor the British Dominions are adequately equipped for defence. And yet the appalling treatment of men, women and children during the Shanghai bombardment renders it imperative to insist on the proper treatment of civilians. It will thus be seen that the status of the League of Nations is involved in the solution of this very serious and complex problem. If one member of the League is allowed to ignore and defy the joint request of all the other powers, supported by the United States, what will be the function of the League in the Future? Its prestige is already seriously threatened—the League Covenant may yet become little better than a scrap of paper!

In the chapter on 'The Missionary in China,' the author notes that while the missionaries still insist on their Treaty rights, the Chinese insist on their abrogation. He thinks it desirable, in view of the invaluable work they have done and are doing, that they should voluntarily relinquish their Treaty rights: 'The Missionary Societies, with the noble definition of the Christian faith contained in the Treaties of Tientsin to guide them, ought surely to place no difficulties in the way of regularizing their position, of giving up privileges to which they have never been honestly entitled. It is difficult to believe that they can do otherwise than welcome an equitable readjustment of their whole unsound position.' The Manchurian problem demands a more concerted and decisive policy. Protracted negotiations are causing China to lose faith in the Western Powers. It is feared that they may be left to form an alliance with Soviet Russia. *The Case for China* is a call to the Nations to realize that the Manchurian question involves fundamental principles and considerations which affect them as well as China. It is a call to arrest Japan's high-handed policy. The author has marshalled his evidence with disturbing cogency and shown himself to be a writer, fearless and independent.

B. A. BARBER.

*The Constitution of The Irish Free State.* By Leo Kohn.  
(Allen & Unwin. 16s.)

THIS is an exhaustive work on the Constitution of the Irish Free State which may justly claim the attention of lawyers and politicians. As the newest of the after-war European Constitutions Dr. Kohn found that, though superficially British, continental thought was reflected in many principles and theories, whilst others were the outcome of Irish history and of the more recent revolution. The claim to intrinsic nationhood and sovereign statehood put forward by the Irish was analogous to that of the combination of sovereign German States

in a single political association in 1871. For five years Dr. Kohn applied himself to a careful study of Irish history and of the movements and events ultimately leading to the Treaty of 1921 and the formulation of the Dáil as a Constituent Assembly in 1922. That is the historical background against which the provisions in the Constitution are placed. Irish experience of British parliamentary rule during the century of the Union was sufficient to demonstrate the necessity for the elimination of this danger, hence the guarantees of individual liberty are embodied on the lines of the American and French declarations. It is of interest also to note the relationship which the author has traced between existing provisions and previous ones, for such method of treatment has served to point out in full the legal significance of each provision.

The Chief Justice of the Irish Free State (The Hon. Hugh Kennedy) writes in the foreword: 'I see in the use of Dr. Kohn's book, written from the wide-view standpoint of current European thought, a hope for the emancipation of our schools of law and political studies from the thralldom which has made them negligible wraiths; a starting-point from which, stimulated to work in the tradition of a revitalised national culture but in a new freedom and breadth of outlook, they may become schools of learning and philosophy of which the nation need not be ashamed, and which may even perhaps discover a message for the distracted world.'

*A Physician's Tour in Soviet Russia.* By Sir James Purves-Stewart. (Allen & Unwin. 5s.)

THE Senior Physician of Westminster Hospital paid a month's visit to Russia last summer with a company of medical men, scientists and others numbering seventy-three. He describes their experiences in Leningrad where he found the guide's description of the virtues of Lenin, his passion for Beethoven, and his devotion to little children, somewhat nauseating 'in view of the subsequent horrible atrocities at which he connived, and many of which he instigated.' Moscow was busier and more thronged than Leningrad. The people were 'healthy looking, clean, comfortably dressed, and mostly young.' Lenin worship amounted to a new religion. Visits were paid to other centres including Nizhni-Novgorod and Kieff. Sir James found Soviet Russia 'a curious sort of purgatory, with an indescribable joyless atmosphere about it, different from that in any civilized country.' The small communist party 'exercises a crushing tyranny over a sullen and cowed population . . . Russian citizens are now reduced to a condition of utter serfdom dominated by a ruthless and fanatical despotism, labelled as democracy.' He feels that time alone will tell whether the country is heading for prosperity or disaster.

*Old Oak.* By J. E. Linnell. (Constable & Co. 7s. 6d.)

WHEN Mr. Linnell died in 1919 he left in manuscript an account of life in his native village of Silverstone in the south of Northamptonshire.

His sons have arranged and edited this with much skill, and the volume is a picture of English life which will give pleasure to all who look upon it. The father, who was for thirty-seven years Vicar of Pavenham, in Bedfordshire, was himself a character, as the memoir prefixed to the story of his birthplace shows. Silverstone was the home of poachers and pugilists and their exploits fill many stirring pages. There was no big house to rule the village. All were more or less independent. Jack was as good as his master. Nor was there any resident clergyman and recurring scandals led to the appointment of a parish clerk and sexton who for forty years managed church affairs with decency. The coming of the Methodists stirred the Church to new life. The Methodist Sunday School gave the poor almost their only chance of learning to read. The Church party awoke to the awful truth that there was a grave danger of all the children growing up Methodists, and established a Sunday School of their own whose numbers were soon greater than those of the Chapel. Some lively stories of Methodist local preachers are given, and election contests, village holidays and festivities, cricket struggles, pugilistic encounters and all the humours and tragedies of village life are narrated with zest by one who bore the mark of Silverstone to the end of his unconventional and many-sided life.

*Law and Life according to Hebrew thought.* By Joseph Yahuda, LL.B. (Humphrey Milford. 10s. 6d.)

THIS book is quite plainly an attempt to glorify the Jewish conception of religion. It is made up of an Introduction and ten chapters, these treating of such subjects as 'Monotheism,' 'God,' 'Equity of Laws,' 'Status of Women,' 'Government,' &c. The writer is evidently a Jew, and, in so far as the book is a piece of apologetic, his aim is to exhibit his own faith and nation to advantage. His success in this direction would have been greater if his knowledge of the Old Testament, to which, of course, he constantly appeals, had been more critically informed. He misinterprets the 'knowledge' round which Adam's temptation gathered, takes the 'sons of God' in the legend of Gen. VI. to be a superior rank of men, ignores, when discussing Israel's monotheism, the monolatry stage in that nation's history. He has to be watched too in the inferences he draws from quotations, e.g., in citing Mal. II. 10 he takes it as evidence 'that national and caste distinctions are inimical to Hebrew thought,' and ignores the fact that the prophet's words are a protest against the prevalent spirit, which was bigotedly national. What, however, is the great blot on the book is the plausible attempt to annex Jesus for Mr. Yahuda's version of Judaism. With Paul, 'the fanatic apostle,' as Mr. Yahuda is pleased to style him, the attempt is not so sustained. But with Christ any point of contact is stressed, and vital differences are ignored. Christ's ideas on Sabbath observance, and His more liberal attitude to women are not considered. The Parable of the Ten Virgins is grotesquely misinterpreted, and Christ's words in Matt. v. 44-48 are claimed for



Hebrew thought, the fact that they were a correction of current Jewish teaching being completely suppressed. Faults like these detract seriously from the value of this book.

A. L. HUMPHRIES.

*Story of the United Methodist Church.* Edited by Henry Smith, John E. Swallow and William Treffry. (Henry Hooks. 3s. 6d. net.)

THIS book of 400 pages tells the Story of the United Methodist Church from September, 1907, to the Uniting Conference of 1932. The Story of each of the Connexional Departments is told for the same period. Biographical sketches are given of over eighty ministers and laymen who have been prominent in United Methodism, with a complete list of ministers who have died in the Methodist New Connexion, the Bible Christian Church, the United Methodist Free Church and the United Methodist Church, from 1797 to November, 1932. There is a complete list of places where the Conferences have been held in these Churches from 1797 to 1932 with their Presidents and Secretaries. Sixty-seven pages present a full list of Ministers and their Circuits, Women Missionaries and their Stations. Seventy-nine pages give the Circuits and Ministers and Overseas Stations with both men and women Missionaries. There is also a complete Chronology of Foreign Missions from 1797 to 1932. The aim has been to include every minister or missionary who has laboured in the Methodist New Connexion, the Bible Christian Church, the Methodist Free Church or the United Methodist Church. In addition to all this, there is a careful Synopsis of the proceedings of the United Methodist Conferences from 1907 to 1932. There are also Numerical Statistics of the Three Sections of the United Methodist Church in Five Year periods from 1860 before Union and of the whole Church since Union in 1907 with a Complete list of United Methodist Guardian Representatives from 1907.

*Wesley.* By James Laver. (Peter Davies. 5s.)

THIS brief Life opens with Samuel Wesley's controversy with his wife as to prayer for the Prince of Orange, and gives a view of life in Epworth rectory and the training of John Wesley at home and at Charterhouse. There is a pleasant account of his years at Oxford and his friendship with the Kirkhams at Stanton. Mr. Laver thinks that Sophia Hopkey's derelictions were trifling, and might have been treated with wise lenience. He criticizes the band rules drawn up by Hutton and Wesley as provoking 'a morbid interest in other people's sins.' Methodism 'modified the public confession until it was no more than a series of testimonies to the Saving Grace of Christ.' Wesley is shown as 'a Man of Feeling, full of the new Humanitarianism, but also as a man of clear and even dry intelligence whose appeal was always to reason. He had no tricks of oratory, no perorations, no dramatic pauses or histrionic gestures . . . he spoke in a clear,

level, unemotional voice; and his matter was as plain as his manner.' Mr. Laver has a chapter on Grace Murray and Mrs. Vazeille and feels that the separation from the Church of England meant for that Church the loss of a large part of the Evangelical element. 'The Methodists gone, the scale tipped in the opposite direction, towards ritualism, and Rome itself. To the Methodists it meant the loss of the wide historical background of the Christian faith.' Wesley had supplied that background in his own person, and when he died there was no one to take his place. The account of his last years is very sympathetic. 'It is small wonder that the devotion he aroused should approach the verge of idolatry.'

*What do the Celtic Churches say?* By Silas Harris, M.S., Vicar of Egmont. (Talbot & Co. 1s.)

This is the first tractate in a series on 'The Church of England and the Holy See.' Its object is to show 'how fully and readily the Celtic Christians recognized the Holy See of St. Peter.' The Church in Gaul and in Britain were one in faith and Ninian's monastic settlement at Whithern in Galloway represented the firstfruits of St. Martin's work. The Celtic liturgies were local varieties of the Gallican rite and in the dispute with Augustine no hostility to Rome was involved. 'There was never any question of excommunication by Rome on the one side, nor of anti-papal prejudice or teaching on the other.' The second pamphlet, *What does the Anglo-Saxon Church Say?* shows that it also acknowledged the supremacy of Rome.

*Intellectual Crime.* By Janet Chance. (Noel Douglas. 5s.)

THIS is a protest against what it calls 'the libellous misrepresentation of Agnosticism, of Secularism and Rationalism which conventional English permits to-day.' We are as jealous as Mrs. Chance for truth but her condemnation of thinkers and scientists, of mothers as 'a drag on the intellectual life of the country' shows what her position is. Her closing sentences will outrage thoughtful Christian men and women: 'Man is developing intellectual courage and with that the further courage to take on responsibility for a world no guide appears to guide.' That would be a dreary outlook and we do not feel such a 'crime' will be committed.

*A Manual of Cataloguing and Indexing.* By J. Henry Quinn & H. W. Acomb. (Allen & Unwin. 10s. 6d.)

THIS is No. 5 in the 'Library Association Series.' It brings skilled experience to bear on the common difficulties of catalogue making. Mr. Acomb deals with author single-entry and references; Mr. Quinn with subject-entry and book-indexing. Illustrative examples are given and rules and methods are discussed in a way that will be of the greatest service to all librarians and especially to young members of the craft. It is a real addition to a valuable series.

## GENERAL

*Indian Problems—Speeches by Lord Irwin.* (Allen & Unwin 12s. 6d.)

THE editor has arranged these speeches in eight divisions. Those delivered before the legislative assemblies and the Chamber of Princes are followed by educational addresses, speeches at State banquets, clubs and chambers of commerce till the farewell at Bombay and the Lecture at Toronto University close the volume. Lord Irwin had a critical task, and these speeches show with what a fine spirit he sought to combine the interests of contending parties. He realized that 'the various dominions of the King Emperor constitute an interdependent organism in which no part can exist in lonely isolation,' and that 'India must take an increasingly important place in the general structure, for she has much both to give to, and to receive from others.' To the Chamber of Princes he dwelt on the identity of interests and solidarity of British India and the Indian States on whom rested more and more responsibility for bringing their administration to the level demanded of all modern Governments. The addresses on education and those to various clubs naturally have rather more of the personal note, but breathe everywhere the same high devotion and strong faith in British Statesmanship and goodwill and in the patriotism and good sense of India. The Massey lecture at Toronto is a masterly survey of present conditions due to intricate political and economic problems. 'No high road runs through the rank jungle, overgrown as it is with the vegetation of a thousand years. Yet if the traveller's course be set true, and his courage high, he will not fail to reach his resting-place.' The speeches give a wide view of Indian conditions and will increase the sense of obligation which his countrymen feel to a wise and clear-sighted Viceroy who like King Asoka has toiled in India, for past and future generations.

*Outlines of Indian Philosophy.* By M. Hiriyanna, M.A. (Allen & Unwin. 15s.)

THIS work is based on the author's lectures as Professor of Sanskrit in Madras University. An introductory lecture takes us back to the beginnings of Indian philosophy in the hymns of the Rigveda and then follows the speculative activity over thirty centuries during which several systems of philosophy were evolved and a great national religion, Brahminism, and a great world religion, Buddhism, were created. The Vedic period is divided into Pre-Upanisadic Thought and The Upanisads. In the first period a prominent place is given to sacrifice and death means the continuance of existence elsewhere, where happiness or misery results according to one's deserts. Theism in the ordinary sense is incompatible with the general spirit of the Upanisads but in one of them 'we find all the requirements of Theism—belief in God,

soul and the world and the conviction that devotion to the Lord is the true means of Salvation.' The Early Post-Vedic period has chapters on Early Buddhism and Jainism. Nirvana means 'flowing out,' the heaven of nothingness. 'For a great portion of the Orient,' it has been said, 'Buddhism was not less a vehicle of culture than Christianity has been for the Occident.' Buddha himself is 'one of the greatest figures in the spiritual history of mankind and his life one of the most inspiring in its lessons to humanity.' Jainism means victory over passions and self. Its primary aim is the perfection of the soul, rather than the interpretation of the universe. Eight chapters are given to the systems which mark the critical period of Indian philosophy. Here the Sutras are the primary source of information. These were developed some centuries before the Christian era, and consist of extremely laconic aphorisms, hardly intelligible without explanation. The Materialistic phase, the later divergence of views among the Buddhist schools of which eighteen arose in India, and the orthodox systems are described with fulness and expert knowledge which make the work an invaluable text-book for students and a reliable guide for those who are interested in the Indian solutions of familiar philosophical problems.

*Reconstruction and Education in Rural India.* By Prem Chand Lal. (Allen & Unwin. 10s.)

THE author spent ten years as Director of Rural Reconstruction at the Institute founded in Bengal by Rabindranath Tagore who in an Introduction to this survey, compares villages to women. 'In their keeping is the cradle of the race. They are nearer to nature than towns, and are therefore in closer touch with the fountain of life.' His Institute seeks to bring about a work of village reconstruction and to flood the choked bed of village life with the stream of happiness. Mr. Lal has been facing the problem in its social, cultural and economic aspects, and from the standpoint of sanitation and health. The Indian villages form three-fourths of the population, but they have been grossly neglected. Village industries have been allowed to decay. Nor can the evils of caste be denied. The Institute at Sriniketan, with its agriculture, dairy and poultry farming and industries of many kinds and the training of the children for earning a living and as future citizens, are described with significant incidents. All activities have to be built round the child, and the development of his personality. Women and girls hold the key to national progress and no change in the moral and material situation can be hoped for until they are educated. The importance of training for future work and the need of good leadership are forcibly brought out. 'The leaders at the Institute must not only have high qualifications, but a high sense of duty and a spirit of service and self-sacrifice which would inspire young men to take up the cause of the millions who need their help and guidance.'

*The Passing of Beatrice. A Study in the Heterodoxy of Dante.*  
By Gertrude Leigh. (Faber & Faber. 10s 6d.)

MISS LEIGH'S *New Light on the Youth of Dante* which appeared in 1929 was the result of thirty years of intensive study and regarded the *Inferno* as a satire on ecclesiastical misrule, veiled under the crude popular notions of hell. She now applies her theory to the story of Beatrice by an analysis of the real and allegorical elements in the *Vita Nuova* of which he wrote an explanation in *The Banquet*. He there pronounces that his purpose was not to delineate earthly passion but to reveal divine truth. The figure of Beatrice concerns all mankind, and is identified 'With the Holy Eucharistic miracle, whose passing from earth men were then awaiting with awe.' The conditions under which Dante wrote are described. There was a great audience thirsting for the truth and he aspired to aid in building up the New Church of Christ in all its former piety and poverty. He accepted Joachim's prophecy that the Presence of Christ was doomed shortly to pass from the Sacrament together with the whole Catholic hierarchy. The *Vita Nuova* is a series of songs of love under whose influence he gave himself to the new Lady. The crisis in his interior life in his eighteenth or nineteenth year 'has all the marks of that instantaneous and explosive process commonly known as "conversion."' His lifelong loyalty to the Catholic Church was joined to the most uncompromising denunciations of the Papal Curia. A Substratum of real events underlies all the visions of the *Vita Nuova*. 'To deny the existence of the living maiden Beatrice is to strip the narrative of its charm.' He was sick at heart at the callous infidelity of high personages in Rome and was struck by the ignorance of the crowd of pilgrims, who had no perception at all of the great mystery of the Christian faith. He set himself 'to refute so far as was possible, in the obscure diction which alone would be tolerated on religious subjects, certain opinions upheld by authority.' Throughout the *Purgatorio* we are in a region of very simple Evangelical teaching. The *Paradiso*, with its vision of the White Rose, shows what a gulf divided the religion of John XXII. and his bodyguard of Inquisitors from the faith of Christ, as proclaimed by Dante. Miss Leigh supports her view by many extracts from the poems, and she certainly gives new meaning to many passages and new interest to the great poet by her fascinating study.

*Moral Man and Immoral Society. A Study in Ethics and Politics.* By Reinhold Niebuhr. (Charles Scribner's Sons. 10s. 6d.)

DR. NIEBUHR is a Professor in Union Theological Seminary, New York, and holds that a sharp distinction must be drawn between the moral and social behaviour of individuals and of national, racial, and economic groups; and that this distinction justifies and necessitates political policies which a purely individualistic ethic must always find



embarrassing. The belief that the growth of human intelligence would automatically eliminate social injustice really dates from the eighteenth century and the Enlightenment. The rational resources, however, are not growing rapidly enough to achieve mastery over the social problems. It has been hoped that a revival of religion would furnish the resources by which men will extricate themselves from their social chaos, but Dr. Niebuhr thinks that religion will always be more fruitful in purifying individual and home life than in the more complex and political relations of modern society. If the fear of corruption could be overcome religious ideals might achieve social and political significance. Class antagonisms within the nations are considered with the attitude of the privileged and the proletarian classes and the securing of justice through revolution or through political force is discussed. How moral values are to be preserved in politics and in individual and social morality is the subject of two closing chapters. We have got rid of some of our illusions. 'We can no longer buy the highest satisfactions of the individual life at the expense of social injustice. We cannot build our individual ladders to heaven and leave the total human enterprise unredeemed of its excesses and corruptions.' The idea that the collective life of mankind can achieve perfect justice may give power to battle with malignant influences, but it is 'dangerous because it encourages terrible fanaticisms. It must therefore be brought under the control of reason.' This book makes one feel the vastness of the task which religion has before it—the making of a world wherein righteousness dwells and rules.

*Music and its Lovers.* By Vernon Lee, Litt.D. (Allen & Unwin. 8s.)

THIS remarkable work announces itself as an empirical study of Emotional and Imaginative Responses to Music. The distinguished writer, who has pondered the subject for 'half a lifetime,' tells us that it is not for musicians or musical critics, though it refers to both. It deals with Aesthetics, but treats them as a branch of Psychology, or an introduction thereto. It describes the various kinds of response, emotional and imaginative, (and even musical) to music, and traces the reasons for their variety.

The plan of the book is ingenious and thoroughly worked. Questionnaires on over a hundred and fifty subjects were addressed to a number of persons more or less musical, and the replies of these 'Answerers' form the basis of many chapters. The book consists of eight parts of which the first deals with Listeners and Hearers, the difference between them being traced in an interesting manner, with a suggestion of a further class of Overhearers. The second part deals with Emotional Responses, discussing tone-quality and sound, timbre, chaos, rhythm and pace. Imaginative Responses follow, after which the question is discussed whether music has a 'meaning,' a 'message,' or is 'just music,' or is sometimes one, sometimes the other. Here the writer introduces another method of inquiry which she

calls 'collective experimentation,' giving the results from various answerers all hearing the same piece of music. For instance, on hearing Chopin's Prelude No. 2, one suddenly visualizes 'a stone winding staircase and someone walking up to a very agitating interview; sadness waits there.' Another says: 'So beautiful that it seems almost impossible to get out of the sensation of enjoyment . . . sad, resigned and courageous, always so rich and lovely.' Another: 'A sensation as of reclining on soft fleecy clouds, too languorous to make any exertion. Then a feeling of trying to screw oneself to do something but failing in the attempt and relapsing into laziness once more.' The conclusion drawn is that these collective experiments confirm the results of the individual schedules, namely that music can have a meaning, a message, which varies according to what is otherwise in the mind of the answerer.

It will be manifest from these brief references that Dr. Lee opens up for her readers a vast field of thought. She has brought to her task wide experience, great learning, and enormous industry, and if this is not exactly the book for a lazy reader, yet for those who will bring to its perusal an active mind, this attempt to explain why the same piece of music may seem interesting and well worth hearing to one person, while to others it may seem dull, or even positively bad, presents a fascinating study. The author closes her book with a contention that in these days of crude excitement music answers the craving for a change to something nobler; offering an excitement no longer crude, but transfigured into spiritual exaltation, into noble enthusiasm. 'Oh, if only these gifted people would stop for a while speaking and preaching and writing; and slake their unsuspected thirst for aesthetic excitement and enthusiasm by listening silently and humbly to some great symphony!'

A. E. SHARPLEY.

*Occupational Misfits.* By Sheila Bevington, B.Sc. (Allen & Unwin. 6s.)

MISS BEVINGTON is a trained economist who has had wide experience as a welfare-supervisor in various centres, and here gives the results of her study of the home circumstances, school records and industrial experiences of two comparable groups of regularly employed and unemployed boys. Her investigations were in Tottenham, and she gives detailed information with statistical tables. She reaches the conclusion that temperamental factors or character are of much greater importance than economic, social or intellectual factors in determining a lad's industrial success. The employed lads showed an unexpected degree of enjoyment in work of a predominantly semi-skilled and manufacturing character. Various remedial steps are suggested. Trade fluctuations and the conception of juvenile labour as a factor in production rather than as a unit under training, have a deleterious effect on the development of industrial stability and fitness. The waste of ability, the thwarting of ambition, the deterioration of

character which result from the haphazard conditions, call for scientific review and replanning of the whole system of youthful employment.

*The Law of the Parish Church.* By W. L. Dale, LL.B.  
(Butterworth & Co. 7s. 6d.)

THIS is an account of the powers, rights and duties of the Incumbent, churchwardens, Parochial Church Council and parishioners which had its origin in a prize essay and led the examiners to encourage its publication. It gives tables of cases, statutes, and canons and states the legal methods of appointments, the form of public worship and services for baptism, marriage and burial. One chapter deals with the organist and choir, parish clerk, and sexton. Finance, care of the fabric, and the churchyard have due attention and the appendix has much valuable information with forms of notice suited to various cases. It is the lucid and reliable work of a barrister and will be of constant service to all who have parochial responsibilities.

*The Golden Boat.* By Rabindranath Tagore. Translated by Rhabani Battacharyi. (Allen & Unwin. 4s. 6d.)

THESE sketches, save one, *The Child*, are now first translated from the Bengali. They are short and have a touch of mystery which often leaves an English reader wondering, but they open up many vistas into Indian love and worship. They have a grace of style and a human touch which comes out in sympathy with young and old. The translator has done his work well though he feels that he has 'failed to convey the exquisite music of the original poems. No poet loses more in translation than Rabindranath Tagore, for none else writes more closely for the ear.' There is variety in the selection, but all the sketches keep close to daily life on the Indian scene.

*Guy Mervyn.* By Florence L. Barclay. (Putnams. 7s. 6d.)

THIS is Mrs. Barclay's first story written when she was twenty-two and followed eighteen years later by *The Rosary*. Fortune was against it when it first appeared but it is sure to smile on it now. Some little revision has been necessary, but its religious tone is as manifest and as attractive as in the later story of which a million and a half copies have been sold. Sir Guy is a fine character and his little sister, Berry, is charming. Lady Elaine has many a fight with trouble but all clouds vanish at last. It is a pleasure to read such a pure and gracious novel.

*The Little Book of Emma.* By Leonard S. Shutter. (Epworth Press. 1s.)

'EMMA' has grown more and more popular since she first appeared eight or nine years ago and this shilling collection of her sayings is full of fun and strong sense. It makes one laugh, but it gets in many a good moral. The arrangement in three groups: Ministers, Love and Marriage and Things in General gives new meaning in Emma's philosophy of life, and it is a thoroughly wholesome one.

# Periodical Literature

## BRITISH

**Hibbert-Journal** (January).—Sir F. Younghusband discusses 'The Destiny of the Universe,' and holds that co-extensive and coincident with the running down proclivity is a winding up process, and that there is no final term to either, but an everlasting rhythm. In his view ours is a 'living universe animated by mind and dominated by the power of a Holy Spirit.' The conception of the universe endowed by the astro-biology of the future with the life which is its due is far grander even than that which we owe to astronomy. Mr. Edwyn Bevan's 'Bishop Barnes on Science and Superstition' criticizes some of his certain beliefs and practices, which are in conflict with Natural Science or with 'Reason.' President Thwing considers 'The Record of the American Rhodes Scholars.' The men themselves have had their manhood enriched; they have become greater and wiser. They have brought to their American institutions the gift of man's reason, disciplined weighty and forceful. 'The Place and Function of Dogma in Christianity' is by Professor C. J. Wright who ventures to say that by the Spirit of truth more worthy statements of our central beliefs may emerge. 'The Church of to-day and to-morrow is called to the task of setting forth in language as simple and as worthy as can be found the central affirmations of Christianity.'

**The Expository Times** (January).—The notes on Dr. Sydney Cave's 'What shall we say of Christ?' dwell on his reference to Mr. Bertrand Russell's criticism of the moral character of Christ, whose belief in eternal punishment indicates 'a vindictive fury against those who would not listen to his preaching.' Dr. Cave has no difficulty in showing that Earl Russell, far from knowing the elements of New Testament criticism, does not seem even to have read the Gospels in the Revised Version. Dr. Raven's inaugural lecture as Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge is described as a characteristic piece of writing on the scope and opportunity of Theology. Dr. Cave's article on 'Brunner and the Moral Problems of our Time' deals with marriage, work and civilization, industry and the State. His book—*The Command and the Ordinance*—is very suggestive and singularly free from the Pharisaic censoriousness and lighthearted idealism which often characterizes Christian pronouncements on moral problems. Dr. Hitchcock's estimate of 'Irenaeus of Lugdunum' describes the man 'who brought learning, culture and religion to the tribes of Gaul,' or as Gregory of Tours puts it brought the State back in a short time to Christianity after a terrible persecution.

**Congregational Quarterly** (January).—The Editor's notes on Irving Babbitt and the Group Movement are of special interest. Dr. Manson's

inaugural at Mansfield on 'The Foundation of Christianity' says 'for Paul Jesus Christ is not the Founder of the Church but the Foundation. Not the first president of the Christian Community but the head—its life and soul self. He is the Church.' Mr. Garfield Curnow writes on 'Fallacies—Ancient and Modern' and other articles are 'The Conservation of Personality,' 'The Laymen's Foreign Mission Enquiry,' 'The Religious Teaching of Mary Webb.'

**Church Quarterly** (January).—Wilfrid Richmond in 'The Gospel of Reminiscence' discusses the Historical Character of the Discourses in the Fourth Gospel, and finds in them 'a considerable number of evidently remembered words; a much larger element of remembered argument and thought.' The evidence under these two heads is corroborated in a degree which it is very difficult to exaggerate, and which can only be exhibited in detail by consideration of the times and the discussions themselves. Other articles are on 'The Mystery Religions'; 'The Ely Chapter Accounts 1604-1677'; 'The Priesthood of the Church'; and 'Christopher Wren—a Comparison.' Wren secures his chief claim to immortality by the faultless proportion and the beautiful contour of the great dome of St. Paul's.

**Journal of Theological Studies** (October).—This is an Index to vols I-XXX (1899-1929) which gives alphabetical lists of authors and subjects reaching 118 pages. There are 34 entries under *Acts*, a page on Apocalypse and Apocalypses and two pages on Apocrypha. Every side of such subjects seems to have been presented by foremost scholars making the thirty volumes a real encyclopedia of religious knowledge.

**Cornhill** (January).—Sir Frederick Pollock's papers 'For my Grandson' are devoted to 'University Memories.' He has seen four Masters of Trinity and gives his impressions of all. Mr. Magnus discusses 'The Epic of America' by James J. Adams. 'My Job,' by an East-End Estates Manager has a piquancy of its own. The account of Mendelssohn and Goethe from a diary by Professor Lore, picked up in an old book-shop, gives a very pleasing glimpse of the boyhood of the great musician. 'A Sheet of Thackeray's Manuscript' will greatly interest those who love and admire him.

**British Journal of Inebriety** (January).—The chief feature is Dr. J. R. Rees' paper on 'Psychological Factors in the Prevention and Treatment of Alcohol and Drug Addiction.' The foundations of personality and character are laid in the first few years of life, before seven. Since there is always an emotional cause for addiction, it is essential to take into account the pattern of life of the individual concerned. Treatment by environmental means—and still more by psychotherapy—can cure the patient. Wiser treatment of the child will save it in adult life from breaking down under the stress of circumstances and taking refuge in alcohol or drugs.



**Science Progress** (January).—The memorial sketch of Sir Ronald Ross and the note on his poetry pay high tribute to one 'who towered above his fellow-men in his genius, his patience and his high moral courage.' He was 'a humble religious man.' Just before he died he awoke, smiled and said 'I shall find out things—yes—yes.' T. E. James gives an account of 'George Edwards, F.R.S. (1694–1775).' He was born at Stratford (Essex), and went to a clergyman's school in Leytonstone. He travelled widely in Europe, and when he returned to England in 1721 he gave himself to natural history studies. His gravestone at West Ham says: 'His Natural History of Birds will remain a lasting Monument of his Knowledge and Ingenuity.'

#### CANADIAN.

**Canadian Journal of Religious Thought** (November–December).—This is the last number of a really valuable Journal. It has served its constituents well for nine years and there is no lack of good material, but more subscribers were needed if it was to pay its way, and they have not come to its help. Mr. Ritchie, Dean of the United Church College, writes on 'The Oxford Group Movement,' Dr. Micklem 'On Scientific and Religious Knowledge,' Professor Wing, of Wesley College, Toronto, 'On the use the ministers may make of the New Testament.' For the Greek papyri discoveries he says there is nothing better than J. H. Moulton's *From Egyptian Rubbish Heaps*. It is an excellent number, and one that preachers would find of real value in their work.

**Agricultural and Industrial Progress in Canada** (December).—Dwells on the wealth of attractions which Canada possesses. 'There is the scenic beauty of the Maritimes, the old French charm of Quebec, the world-famed Niagara and the grandeur of the Rocky Mountains; while, in all the provinces, countless lakes, rivers and forests, provide unrivalled facilities for fishing, hunting and both summer and winter sports.' 1931 saw an output of 685,000 cases of salmon, early in October the 1932 output reached 1,000,208 cases.

#### AMERICAN.

**The Journal of Religion** (January).—Professor Harper of Vanderbilt University, gives an account of 'The Gazi of Turkey.' He was called Mustapha at his birth, and his military teacher added Kemal, or perfection. The future 'Father of the Republic' was a problem for his widowed mother who found him fast developing into a street urchin at Salonika. She sent him to the local military academy and then to that of Constantinople. His independence of mind made him disliked by his fellow officers, but he was the only member of the military staff whom the Germans could not cajole. He was an ardent patriot and 'forged the Turkish republic on the anvil of his own

devoted patriotism.' Dr. Harper cherishes high hopes of Turkish progress under the Gazi. Other articles are 'Law and Religion'; 'Love in the Fourth Gospel'; 'The later Books of the New Testament' and 'American Lutheran Synods and Slavery, 1830-60.'

**Moslem World** (January).—'Whither Islam' describes Moslems as supernaturalists through and through. After a fashion they are genuinely and thoroughly religious. The Christian Church has to complete the imperfect message of Mohammed and guide his people out of the heresy as to the person of Christ. Dr. Margoliouth does not allow Islam to be a Christian heresy, but shows its important points of contact with Judaism.

**The Colgate-Rochester Bulletin** (November).—This is the Dedication Number of the Divinity School which gives full particulars of the growth of the scheme, the style of the buildings and the services and addresses at the opening. Many illustrations of the College and its rooms are given. It is a striking memorial of a successful enterprise.

#### FOREIGN

**Calcutta Review** (November—December).—Mr. Pannikar writes on 'Indian Ideal of Marriage.' In the Shastras the Brahma form of marriage, by which the bride is given to a man who has not solicited her, is considered the best. 'If the institution of marriage has to be regulated from the social standpoint strictly, room cannot be found for the personal wishes of the people concerned. So the system which obtained in the Royal Houses of Europe is the system which prevails throughout Hindu Society.' 'The Essence of Rabindranath's Poetry' regards him as the incarnation of the soul of India; 'The Messiah of our culture, bringing to the fever-stricken world the message of love.'

**United Church Review** (December).—Dr. Kagawa reports the completion of the three years' period of the Kingdom of God Movement. The real movement is still to be achieved, for there are only 250,000 Christians among the sixty-four millions of Japan proper. A great many places with 5,000 inhabitants have not yet been reached by the Gospel. The most encouraging result is the starting of peasant Gospel Schools. In the cities a great many of the serious-minded labourers are seeking to know the truth of Christ. Lay preachers are needed and widespread literary evangelism. Kagawa pleads for a thousand times more energy in order to reach the unoccupied evangelistic territory of Japan. (January).—In 'About Kagawa' Dr. Bates says he knows no parson anywhere whom he would consult with such confidence about the essentials of Christianity as Kagawa. He listened to his lectures on St. Paul's Christology and found himself 'taken into deeper depths of personal mystical religious experience' than any other teacher had taken him. He interprets the Cross as a new and vitalizing power in the whole movement of personal and social redemption.